DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 362 CS 509 994

AUTHOR McCroskey, Linda L.
TITLE An Examination of Factors Influencing U.S. Student Perceptions of Native and Non-Native U.S. Teacher Effectiveness.
PUB DATE 1998-11-00
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association (84th, New York, NY, November 21-24, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Apprehension; *Communication Problems; Communication Research; *Ethnocentrism; Higher Education; *Indigenous Personnel; *Intercultural Communication; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Effectiveness; Undergraduate Students

ABSTRACT

This investigation examines factors influencing United States student perceptions of native and non-native United States teacher effectiveness. A questionnaire employing measures of ethnocentrism, intercultural communication apprehension, willingness to communicate, and motivation was completed by 204 native United States undergraduate students. Further, students responded to affective, cognitive, and behavioral measures with regard to native and non-native teacher effectiveness. The results showed that native United States students significantly evaluated native United States teachers more positively than non-native United States teachers. Simple correlations between evaluation scores for the two teacher types (native and non-native United States) for each dependent variable suggest that students in this study responded very specifically to the different teachers (intracultural versus intercultural context) rather than on a general trait basis. The positive associations with the difference scores obtained indicated that more ethnocentric students tend to evaluate native United States teachers more favorably than non-native United States teachers. Students who had high levels of intercultural communication apprehension rated non-native United States teachers more negatively than native United States teachers. Stepwise regression analyses revealed that up to 10% of the variability in differences of student perceptions of native United States and non-native United States teachers could be predicted by student levels of ethnocentrism. The result of the regression analyses suggest that student bias in the form of ethnocentrism is a factor influencing perceptions of teacher effectiveness. The magnitude of the effects observed in the present study suggest that true differences in teacher effectiveness are most likely the primary causes of the perceived differences between native United States and non-native United States teacher effectiveness. (Contains 149 references and 12 tables of data.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 427 362

Running Head: Ethnocentrism and Effectiveness

An Examination of Factors Influencing U.S. Student Perceptions of Native and Non-native U.S. Teacher Effectiveness

Linda L. McCroskey
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo

Presented at the 1998 annual meeting of the National Communication Association Conference, New York, New York

CS509994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. McCroskey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Abstract

This investigation examines factors influencing U.S. student perceptions of native and non-native U.S. teacher effectiveness. A questionnaire employing measures of ethnocentrism, intercultural communication apprehension, willingness to communicate, and motivation was completed by 204 native U.S. students. Further, students responded to affective, cognitive, and behavioral measures with regard to native and non-native teacher effectiveness. The results showed that native U.S. students significantly evaluated native U.S. teachers more positively than non-native U.S. teachers. Simple correlations between evaluation scores for the two teacher types (native and non-native U.S.) for each dependent variable suggest that students in this study responded very specifically to the different teachers (intracultural versus intercultural context) rather than on a general trait basis. The positive associations with the difference scores obtained indicated that more ethnocentric students tend to evaluate native U.S. teachers more favorably than non-native U.S. teachers. Students who had high levels of intercultural communication apprehension rated non-native U.S. teachers more negatively than native U.S. teachers. Stepwise regression analyses revealed that up to 10 percent of the variability in differences of student perceptions of native U.S. and non-native U.S. teachers could be predicted by student levels of ethnocentrism. The result of the regression analyses suggest that student bias in the form of ethnocentrism is a factor influencing perceptions of teacher effectiveness. The magnitude of the effects observed in the present study suggest that true differences in teacher effectiveness are most likely the primary causes of the perceived differences between native U.S. and non-native U.S. teacher effectiveness.

An Examination of Factors Influencing U.S. Student Perceptions of Native and Non-native U.S. Teacher Effectiveness

The movement of students and scholars across national boundaries is a phenomenon affecting countries throughout the world. This flow of scholars and students, along with the emerging global economy and growing interdependence among nations, is altering higher education. Once comparatively homogeneous faculty and student bodies are becoming more culturally diverse (Brislin, 1990).

How these international faculty and students are viewed by their hosts from a psychocultural-communicative perspective is the central concern of this paper. The psychocultural-communicative perspective focuses on variables involved in the personal ordering process (i.e., the process giving stability to psychological processes). "The variables influencing our communication with strangers include our stereotypes of and attitudes toward (e.g., ethnocentrism and prejudice) strangers' groups" (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997, p. 48). As indicated by these authors, "our stereotypes and attitudes create expectations of how strangers will behave. Our expectations, in turn, influence the way in which we interpret incoming stimuli and the predictions we make about strangers' behavior" (p. 48). These authors argue that the influence of expectations on interpretations of strangers' behavior is mediated through the anxiety and uncertainty we experience in the interaction.

In particular, this paper focuses upon international sojourners who fill the role of instructors at U.S. universities and the nature of the context in which these teachers teach (intercultural classroom context). For the purpose of this paper, international sojourners are defined as individuals whose native language is not English and whose native culture is not the United States. These teachers, and student teachers, are distinguished by virtue of being culturally different from their hosts.

It generally is accepted by scholars, researchers, and trainers that when sojourners reside in a host culture and interact with people of the host culture, they encounter significant intercultural challenges and difficulties. Besides language differences, according to Tamam (1993), difficulties arise due to cultural differences and unfamiliarity, "intergroup posture," and the accompanying experience of stress, as identified by Kim (1991). This perspective (psychological adaptation) typically references stress on the part of the sojourner, but, as Kim (1991) points out, cultural difficulties in intercultural encounters introduce unfamiliarity with each of the participants' messages and meanings. Such differences between dissimilar interactants create feelings of anxiety and uncertainty for both sojourners and host nationals. Gudykunst and Hammer (1988) argue that as the degree of heterogeneity increases between parties in an interaction, levels of anxiety and uncertainty increase. Further, Gudykunst (1995) argues that management of anxiety and uncertainty is essential to communication effectiveness.

Purpose of Study

Some research focusing on the intercultural context has emphasized predictive factors, or abilities, which are considered to facilitate sojourner adaptation and increase effectiveness (Gudykunst, 1995; Kim, 1991; Tamam, 1993). Although this body of literature has informed scholars, there appears to be a lack of integration of findings in the interpersonal context with those in the intercultural context (Martin & Hammer, 1989). Further, much of the research in this area has neglected to address important questions of how these two contexts are similar and different. According to Gudykunst and Kim (1997), the underlying process of communication between people of different cultures (intercultural communication) is essentially the same as the process in intracultural communication (communication between people of the same culture), and the variables under consideration are the same. The significance of this, however, lies in how the importance of these variables fluctuate depending upon the nature of the context. That is, some variables take on greater (lesser) saliency and intensity in intercultural interactions as compared

to intracultural interactions when perceptions of effectiveness are investigated (e.g., language ability tends to become more important for interactants whose native languages differ as compared to those interactions where the participants share the same native language).

Nevertheless, previous writing and research has been useful in illuminating factors which may prove to be especially important in the investigation of perceived teacher effectiveness. Important to this paper, though, is the assumption that teacher effectiveness is a receiver-based construct. This means that "actual" effectiveness is not the focus, rather the investigation of the contextual factors which influence receivers to "perceive" a person to be effective is most relevant. From the reference point of the receiver, then, the extent to which factors influence assessments of native and non-native teacher effectiveness differently is the focus of this study. This study examines perceptions of American students and how their perceptions of effectiveness differ for American teachers and non-American teachers.

The major assumption of this study is that intercultural communication contexts, in contrast to intracultural contexts, lend themselves to higher levels of uncertainty and anxiety, and lower levels of knowledge and attributional confidence among the participants with regard to communication behavior. As such, assessments of teacher effectiveness may be derived from differentiated criteria for those who are considered culturally similar (intracultural criteria) and those who are culturally dissimilar (intercultural criteria) due to the injection of higher levels of anxiety associated with intercultural communication contexts. Gudykunst and Kim (1997) assert that higher levels of anxiety can result in a rigidity of categories (stereotyping) and a tendency toward mindlessness.

Mindfulness, according to Langer (1989), suggests concentration on the process of communicating rather than the outcomes of communication. In the context of student-teacher relationships, mindful students create more categories (than native teacher and non-native teacher) to think about teachers thereby permitting more personalized information to be used to make predictions for other behavior. In short, mindfulness suggests that rigid stereotypes (e.g., ethnocentric thinking) are released and meanings are based on person-related (teacher) information instead of broad, categorical information. Therefore, the anxiety that characterizes intercultural contexts may also perpetuate mindlessness and further serve to inhibit the triggering of the same standards for judging effectiveness for all persons in that different type of information is used in assessing others.

Literature Review

Teacher Effectiveness

In the past two decades, research in instructional communication has addressed the question of what constitutes an effective teacher (Andersen, 1979a; Frymier, 1994; Kearney & McCroskey, 1980; McCroskey, Barraclough, Fayer, Richmond, & Sallinen, 1995; Norton & Nussbaum, 1980; Nussbaum & Scott, 1980; Richmond, 1990; Scott & Wheeless, 1975). Following the process-product paradigm, this line of research has approached this question by identifying possible teacher behaviors (in the form of styles, strategies, and immediate verbal and nonverbal messages) that predict successful outcomes in terms of student learning domains. For the majority of this work, positive student learning is equated with teacher effectiveness (i.e., teacher ability to produce affective, behavioral, and cognitive student learning).

This study also addresses predictors of teacher effectiveness, but from a slightly different approach than has been the tradition. Rather than focusing exclusively on teacher behaviors, the goal of this study is to illuminate factors surrounding the interactional context that are also influential in affecting student perceptions of teacher effectiveness. This alternative approach does not negate the influence of actual teacher behaviors and the functions these behaviors serve in the classroom situation, rather the current approach focuses upon the nature of the context and

how receivers, or students, are affectively and cognitively influenced in terms of effectiveness ratings of the teachers and teacher behaviors--as perceived from an intercultural versus an intracultural receiver vantage.

Researchers know a lot about the behavioral preferences of American students with American teachers. Work has also been extended to examine whether the predictive relationships revealed in the past are generalizable to other cultures. Cross-cultural and inter-ethnic instructional research has shown that some of these relationships hold true when comparing same-culture participants, and that some of the predictive relationships do not hold true when comparing same-culture participants. For example, research by Collier and Powell (1986) reveals that although an instructor uses immediacy behaviors, students' perceptions of the types of immediacy behaviors differ due to student cultural background. According to Gotch and Brydges (1990), "since cultural/ethnic differences influence one's beliefs, attitudes, and values, it would seem most probably that perceptions of what constitutes an effective teacher would also be influenced" (p. 6).

Collier and Powell (1986) questioned the degree to which our notions of effective teaching can be extended to multicultural classrooms. They hypothesized that Black-Americans, Latinos, Asian-Americans, and Anglos represent cultural groups with different preferences for relationally appropriate and effective behaviors in the classroom context. The results of their study, and subsequent follow up studies examining ethnic groups (Collier & Powell, 1990), indicate that there are differences among cultural groups in terms of preferences for certain teacher behaviors. For example, the results support the idea that "immediacy serves different functions for students from different ethnic backgrounds at different times in the course" (Collier & Powell, 1990, p. 347).

Hecht, Larkey, and Johnson (1992) argue that communication researchers have only recently begun to incorporate perspectives of participants from groups other than mainstream U.S. culture (Abe & Wiseman, 1983; Collier, 1988,1989; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1988; Hecht & Ribeau, 1987) and, therefore, most of our understanding is based on an European American perspective of what constitutes effectiveness. The same argument applies to the instructional literature. Neulip (1995) noted the ensuing movement and value for the inclusion of multiple-perspectives in his study of matched-race (African-American teacher/African-American student, Euro-American teacher/Euro-American student) perceptions of immediacy and student perceived learning. Further, Jordan and Merkel (1995) found that the strongest predictor of perceived student cognitive learning (one aspect of teacher effectiveness) for Anglo-American, African-American, and Hispanic teachers (but not for Asian teachers) was teacher race. The results from this study should be tentatively viewed, though, as the sample sizes for teacher culture, other than Anglo-American, were quite small.

The results of these studies and those incorporating multiple-perspectives (i.e., research with an intercultural/ethnic focus), imply that cultural differences "influence conversations whether through misunderstandings or through actual conflict about what is valued or expected communication" (Hecht et al., 1992, p. 212). The integrating factor that connects these views is that there are culturally specific elements that affect communication, whether the ethnic or cultural identity of participants evokes ingroup/outgroup perceptions or the cultural styles and norms define differing standards of effectiveness and set off misunderstanding or disagreement (Hecht et al., 1992).

Neulip (1995) echoes Hecht et al.'s (1992) position in his conclusion that one explanation why, in his study, students' perceptions of African-American teacher effectiveness were influenced by immediacy to a lesser extent than students' perceptions of Euro-American teachers, may have been the expectations that audiences (students) have for immediacy within African-American speech acts. Because student expectations were positively upheld (i.e., that African-American teachers are highly immediate in the classroom), Neulip (1995) reasons that there was less of an impact of immediacy on perceived student learning. Had the expectations of the teacher

behaviors been violated to a noticeable degree (extremely immediate or not immediate), though, teacher effectiveness ratings may have been increased or decreased depending upon the valence of the violation.

Anxiety, Uncertainty, and Expectations

In generating his anxiety/uncertainty management theory (AUM), Gudykunst (1995) asserts that expectations are but one of many factors which influence perceived effectiveness. Gudykunst (1991) reports that communication with strangers, or dissimilar others, usually is based on negative expectations and that research (Stephan & Stephan, 1985) indicates that actual or anticipated interaction with a member of a different ethnic or cultural group leads to anxiety. Stephan & Stephan (1985) note that one of the emotional reactions we have to disconfirmed expectations of strangers is frustration. Such frustration can be a result of obstacles to goal achievement and often leads to aggressive behavior or a display of negative feelings (Brislin, Cushner, Cherrie, & Yong, 1986).

Gudykunst (1995) assumes that "the management of anxiety and uncertainty is the basic cause influencing effective communication" (p.17) and that "superficial causes" of effective communication (i.e., those that influence uncertainty and anxiety, but are not directly related to the outcomes) such as identity, positive expectations, and similarity are mediated through the management of anxiety and uncertainty. He argues that "the anxiety we experience when communicating with strangers is largely unconscious. To be managed, it must be brought to a conscious level (i.e., we must become mindful). To understand strangers, we must cognitively manage our anxiety" (p. 65). This suggests that those who experience high levels of anxiety may not be mindful of situations or they may engage in rigid thinking (i.e., they use rigid stereotypes to interpret others' behavior).

Stephan and Stephan (1985) report that there is a relationship among the amount of intergroup anxiety experienced, level of ethnocentrism, valence of stereotypes, and the amount of intergroup contact that we have experienced--that is, the fewer experiences that a person has had with other groups, the less likely that we have had bad experiences and, therefore, we tend to hold more positive stereotypes (or at least not negative), are less ethnocentric, and have less anxiety associated with anticipated communication. This finding has been contradicted by other researchers (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1988) and is counterintuitive in that increased intergroup contact may foster a motivation to create new categories or to seek out information which may increase one's attributional confidence. Increased attributional confidence, for example, has been associated with reducing uncertainty and anxiety (Witte, 1993). Gudykunst and Hammer (1988) recognize that people become more comfortable with the cultural differences they might have to confront and they experience a decrease in the feelings of uncertainty that commonly lead to anxiety when these people have had positive experiences in cultural training or in previous interactions with culturally dissimilar others.

Attitudes, Ethnocentrism, and Stereotypes

The relationship among attitudinal factors such as ethnocentrism, stereotyping, and anxiety are important to the discussion of expectations and perceptions of teacher effectiveness. "Attitudes an individual holds toward members of a foreign culture play a critical role in influencing how positive or negative his/her impression is of the other culture and its people as well as the degree of mutual understanding that is achieved" (Wiseman, Hammer, & Nishida, 1989, p. 351). "An attitude is a learned predisposition to respond in an evaluative (from extremely favorable to extremely unfavorable) manner toward some attitude object" (Davidson & Thompson, 1980, p. 27). When people come into contact with individuals from other cultures, they observe differences in customs, behavior patterns, language and more. Most people react to such differences based on their attitudes.

Gudykunst, Wiseman, and Hammer's (1977) model of a general cross-cultural attitude consists of three interrelated components (affective, cognitive, conative). The affective component concerns the individual's feelings of like/dislike toward the attitude object, and may be conceived of as the degree of ethnocentrism felt by the individual (Wiseman et al. 1989). The cognitive component refers to the how the individual views the attitude object and is composed of the stereotypes he/she has of the other culture and its members. The conative component refers to the individual's behavioral tendencies toward the attitude object and reflects the social distance intentions of the individual towards members of the other culture.

Research suggests that the affective, cognitive, and conative dimensions of Gudykunst et al.'s (1977) model are interrelated. For instance, Levine and Campbell (1972) found a relationship between ethnocentrism and stereotypes, Rubovitz and Maehr (1973) found that ethnocentrism and stereotypes influence discriminatory behavior toward outgroup members, and ethnocentrism has been found to influence the degree of social distance between members of social groups (O'Driscoll & Feather, 1983).

Ethnocentrism was originally introduced as "the technical name for the view of things in which one's own is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it" (Sumner, 1940, p. 13). According to Sumner's (1940) work, ethnocentrism "involves at least four different aspects of group behavior—ingroup integration, self-regard or hyperevaluation of the ingroup, hostile relations between ingroup and outgroups, and derogatory stereotyping of outgroup characteristics" (Brewer & Campbell, 1976, p. 74).

Brewer and Campbell (1976) summarize Sumner's description of the complementary nature of these four aspects of ethnocentrism, providing support for Gudykunst et al.'s (1977) assertion that the affective, cognitive, and conotative dimensions of their model of a cross-cultural attitude are interrelated. "Ingroup integration and solidarity is promoted by the tendency to exalt the ingroup and perceive its way of life as superior to that of other groups; hyperevaluation of the ingroup is maintained by contrast with distorted, derogatory perceptions of the customs and practices of outgroups which are also seen as threatening and hostile; in intergroup relations, the interests of the ingroup are considered paramount, which leads to hostility manifested in forms of aggression ranging from verbal expressions of dislike through types of exclusion (social distance) to overt violence. Theoretically, then, identification with the ingroup and dissociation from outgroups are two sides of the same coin" (p. 74).

More recent formulations have emphasized the affective-evaluative nature of ethnocentrism, rather than treating the construct as being multidimensional. Brislin (1990) contends that "it is very difficult to think about behaviors that are different from the ones we are used to and not judge them as wrong. Difference invites comparison and evaluation" (p. 36). Ethnocentrism refers to an attitude, or the "tendency to interpret and evaluate others' behavior using our own standards" (Gudykunst, 1991, p. 67). According to Triandis (1990), people react to differences "ethnocentrically," that is "they use their own ethnic group as the standard and judge others favorably if they are like in-group members and unfavorably if they are not" (p. 34).

This evaluative tendency is natural and unavoidable, though it is possible to have a low degree (or high degree) of ethnocentrism (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997). Our own culture provides us with a cognitive framework for thinking about the world. Our worldview is a philosophy which guides judgments of our surroundings. For those people who have only been exposed to one culture, there is no other worldview. Even people who have had contact with people from other cultures, similar to their own, still may not have experienced a really different culture. So it is natural to use our own culture as the standard and judge other cultures by the extent that they "meet the standard" (Brislin, 1990). The primary consequence of high ethnocentrism is the likelihood of distorting and, therefore, misinterpreting messages from strangers (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997).

In part, our expectations and our level of ethnocentrism are influence by the stereotypes we have, or how we categorize people into groups. "Stereotypes refer to beliefs about a group of

people that give insufficient attention to individual differences among members of that group" (Brislin, 1993, p. 171). Tajfel (1981) describes stereotypes as generalizations reached by individuals. "They derive in large measure from, or are an instance of, the general cognitive process of categorizing" (pp. 146-147). This view of stereotyping captures the normality of the process and reflects people's need to organize, remember, and retrieve information that might be useful to them as they attempt to achieve their goals and meet demands of every day life (Brislin, 1993).

Hewstone and Giles (1986) outline several generalizations about the stereotyping process relevant to this discussion. First, stereotyping is the result of our tendency to overestimate the degree of association between group membership and psychological attributes. While there may be some association between group memberships and psychological characteristics of members, it is smaller than we assume when we are not mindful in our communication (Gudykunst, 1991). Second, stereotyping can influence the way we process information, where we tend to remember favorable information with regard to ingroups and less favorable information about outgroups. This tendency biases our interpretation of messages from these members. Third, stereotypes also create expectations regarding how members of other groups (as well as our own) will behave. Stereotypes are activated automatically when we interact with people who are different (Devine, 1989) and, unconsciously, we assume that our stereotypes are correct and therefore we try to confirm our expectations by behaving as if they are true. The influence of a self-fulfilling prophecy has been noted by other researchers (Gudykunst, 1995; Wiseman et al., 1989). For example, if a student assumes that a teacher is not effective and communicates with this teacher based upon this assumption, then this teacher will appear to be not effective. Thus, not only can stereotypes influence behavior toward others, inaccurate stereotypes can lead to inaccurate predictions about the behavior of both ingroup and outgroup members (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1988).

The behavioral, or conative, component specified by Gudykunst et al.'s (1977) model refers to the actions associated with our attitudes toward members of outgroups. Wiseman et al. (1989) state that "it can be argued that the more predisposed one is to interact and associate with other persons, the more accurate the information he/she should gather, thus increasing his/her understanding. Conversely, the greater the social distance (i.e., the more prejudiced against interacting and associating with other persons), the more likely inaccurate information will be gathered, thus increasing misunderstanding" (p. 353). The relationship between social distance and accurate attributions is clear. The greater the social distance exhibited, the greater the likelihood that inaccurate information is gathered, resulting in a lack of attributional accuracy. Inaccurate attributions may result in low levels of attributional confidence (e.g., uncertainty) which has been associated with higher levels of anxiety (Witte, 1993).

Social distance, as discussed by Luken's (1978), refers to the approach-avoidance tendency of an individual in reference to members of other groups. Lukens (1978) isolated three consequences of ethnocentrism, in terms of social distance, with regard to way in which people talk to and talk about people who are different. She identifies three types of ethnocentric speech: "to demonstrate lack of concern for persons of other cultures and reflect an insensitivity to cultural differences (the distance of indifference), (2) to avoid or limit the amount of interaction with outgroups (the distance of avoidance), and (3) to demonstrate feelings of hostility towards outgroups and to deride or belittle them (the distance of disparagement)." (p. 41)

Gudykunst (1991) clarifies Lukens' (1978) view of ethnocentrism by asserting that ethnocentrism should be viewed on a continuum whereby low levels of ethnocentrism "should be manifested in a tendency to treat members of other groups as equal" (p. 67-68). He notes that Lukens' distance of indifference would fall in the center of such a continuum, and that the distance of avoidance and the distance of disparagement would fall progressively toward the high end of the continuum. Therefore, using the distance of avoidance would be associated with people who are moderately to highly ethnocentric.

Other researchers have described communication constructs in terms of the dimension of approach-avoidance (e.g., McCroskey, 1992; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987; McCroskey & Richmond, 1990). Willingness to communicate is a person's general attitude toward talking with others. McCroskey (1992) states that the construct references a person's predisposition to approach or avoid communication. "It is specifically posited to be associated with constructs relating to apprehension or anxiety about communication as well as constructs associated with behavioral tendency regarding talking frequency" (p. 21). A person's willingness to communicate should be related to the social distance, or level of ethnocentrism, one displays in interaction.

Although people usually exhibit willingness to communicate (WTC) tendencies across situations, WTC is situationally dependent. According to Richmond and McCroskey (1995), an individual's level of communication apprehension (an internal, cognitive state that is centered around the fear of communicating) is probably the best predictor of a person's WTC. Therefore, in the intercultural situation, if a person is moderately or highly ethnocentric, the person would likely be less willing to communicate. More precisely, if a student is moderately or highly ethnocentric with regard to the teacher, the student will be less willing to communicate and experience higher levels of anxiety.

Motivation

Detweiler (1980) argues that cognitive models have tended to ignore the importance of motivational factors on the interpersonal interaction process. In order to better understand the relationship between approach-avoidance tendencies and evaluative indicators in intracultural and intercultural interactions, an examination of reasons why some people are less motivated than other is needed.

Motivation is typically defined as existing as both a state and a trait (Brophy, 1986; 1987; Keller, 1983). Trait motivation is fairly stable and resistant to situational influences. State motivation, on the other hand, is determined by situational influences and is not stable. One such situational influence is the nationality or ethnicity of the teacher in comparison to the nationality or ethnicity of the student. Dissimilarity between the teacher and student in this regard changes the nature of the context to an intercultural context, whereas similarity between teacher and student determines the situation to be one of an intracultural context.

Brophy (1986) conceptualized student motivation as both a trait, which is an enduring disposition to value learning, and as a state which is situation specific, such as in a particular classroom with a particular topic or teacher. A precondition for motivation, established by Brophy (1986), is a supportive environment. He contends that a supportive environment is one which does not increase a student's anxieties, because "anxious or alienated students are unlikely to develop motivation to learn academic content" (p. 19). According to Frymier (1993), while communication apprehension is not referenced directly (in the research discussed above), students who experience high levels of state communication apprehension may be less motivated in the classroom due to fear of being embarrassed or criticized for making a mistake.

Another factor linked to both student motivation and supportive environments is the familiarity that an individual has with others in the context. Brewer and Campbell (1976) explored the potential effect of intergroup contact or familiarity on evaluative bias. In their review of the UNESCO studies of national stereotypes, they found that nationals with high levels of contact with individuals from other nations showed less bias toward high favorability in ratings of their own nations, greater willingness to attribute favorable traits to members of other nations, and greater correspondence between their attributions to the ingroup and attributions received from members of other groups (this effect was also found by Triandis & Vassilou, 1967). However, Brewer and Campbell (1976) found no evidence for a favorability bias in outgroup evaluation based on familiarity on the individual level. They argue that "individual familiarity is relatively unimportant in determining ingroup-outgroup attitudes in comparison with intergroup familiarity. On the other hand, individual social distance ratings may reflect each respondent's

perceptions of what the ingroup's norms are relative to each outgroup and thus provide a better indication of how attraction mediates evaluation" (p. 105).

Rationale for Study

The concern of this study is to determine whether measures of students' traits and state orientations are predictive of how they will evaluate culturally similar and dissimilar teachers. An extensive body of research, summarized in detail by Byrne (1971), has shown that people evaluate positively those whom they perceive to hold similar attitudes and beliefs and evaluate negatively those whom they perceive to hold dissimilar attitudes and beliefs. Research on the similarity-attraction hypothesis provides us with evidence to support the observation that a positive relationship exists between perceived similarity and interpersonal attraction (Berscheid & Walster, 1979; Byrne, 1971; Gudykunst & Nishida, 1984).

Research by Brewer and Campbell (1976) on intergroup attraction and perception revealed a non-linear relationship between perceived group similarity and evaluation bias. They found that ratings from highly similar groups were significantly more favorably biased than ratings from less similar groups and that outgroups at the intermediate level of similarity produced more unfavorably biased ratings than did highly dissimilar outgroups. This research, then, suggests that American student evaluations of teacher effectiveness may be favorably biased for native U.S. teachers and unfavorably biased for non-native U.S. teachers; it also suggests that the degree and valence of these evaluations may be influenced by the perceived level of similarity between the student and teacher.

Anxiety

McCroskey's (1970) original conceptualization of communication apprehension (CA) focused exclusively on oral communication and included no specific mention of whether the construct is a trait-like feature of the individual or an individual's response to situational features of the communication context. Certain "types" of communication environments may be more or less anxiety producing than others. Buss (1980) argues that some of the salient situational features leading to increased anxiety are novelty, unfamiliarity, and dissimilarity. Hence, those situations containing new, atypical, and/or conspicuously different stimuli are likely to increase one's sense of anxiety. Based on Buss's (1980) criteria, initial interaction with someone, or interacting with strangers, may produce anxiety in persons.

Gudykunst and Kim (1997) argue that when individuals are confronted with cultural differences they tend to view people from other cultures as strangers. These authors contend that interaction with people from cultures other than our own tend to involve the highest degree of "strangeness" and the lowest degree of familiarity. Thus, there is greater uncertainty in these situation. In such situations, then, there is not only high uncertainty, but also high anxiety. Thus, intercultural situations are one context that may heighten anxiety. Gudykunst and Kim (1997) report that actual or anticipated interaction with members of different groups (e.g., cultures or ethnic groups different from our own) leads to anxiety. "This type of communication anxiety can be labeled intercultural communication apprehension; that is, the fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated interaction with people from different groups, especially different cultural or ethnic groups" (Neulip & McCroskey, 1997, p. 6).

Information approach-avoidance. Another construct related to the examination of the affective domain is called willingness to communicate. Willingness to communicate is seen as a predisposition for approaching, as opposed to avoiding, communication. It is presumed that people who are highly willing to communicate are very likely to initiate communication when under conditions of free choice. McCroskey (1992) states that: "we expect predispositions to be associated with behaviors" (p. 8). However, he cautions, we should: "not expect any given predisposition to be perfectly related to any given behavior. What one chooses to do in a given circumstance may be in conflict with one predisposition while at the same time be consistent with

another. Individual behaviors are subject to the influence of many factors, not just single predispositions" (p. 8). For example, ethnocentric attitudes may inhibit a person's willingness to communicate with people who are perceived to be strangers, or are from disparate cultural, racial, or ethnic groups, whereas a person may be predisposed to being highly willing to communicate with others who are perceived at some level to be similar to themselves.

When examining the approach-avoidance aspect of persons in an intercultural interaction, other factors may "outweigh" a person's general predisposition to interact. Increased anxiety, ambiguity, and levels of ethnocentrism may all provide rational reasons for discrepancies in behavior. That is, a person who is generally willing to communicate may behaviorally be less willing to communicate under circumstances where anxiety and/or ambiguity are high, and where negative attitudes and expectations are aroused. As stated previously, intercultural situations are frequently characterized by high degrees of each of these variables (Stephan, 1985).

Attitude toward dissimilar others. If people are "ethnocentric," they use standards from their own cultural background to judge and to make conclusions about people from other cultures. Triandis (1990) points out that if people understand the reasons other people behave as they do, then ethnocentric thinking diminishes. An important goal of sophisticated cross-cultural thinking (the opposite of ethnocentrism) is to understand behavior from the point of view of people in the other culture. This is to say that the goal is to make isomorphic attributions for behaviors. Unfortunately, this goal is not common for everyone. In the case of the ethnocentric person, there is a bias toward the ingroup that causes us to evaluate different patterns of behavior negatively, rather than try to understand them.

Motivation. According to Frymier (1993), students' trait motivation in the classroom is the biggest predictor of state motivation: "what a student enters the class with (in terms of motivation) continues to impact that student in spite of situational variables" (p. 462). Keller (1987) identifies student expectations as a major component in motivation and associates expectations with persistence and involvement. Frymier (1993) summizes that it is likely that past classroom experiences and expectations associated with these experiences are likely to have a greater impact on motivation than the situational features surrounding a classroom situation where the student has had limited exposure to the context. In short, student state motivation in current classroom contexts is based on experiences that students have had in similar classroom contexts and this motivation level acts as a baseline from which situational variables, such as context type (intercultural or intracultural) or anxiety, may influence motivation positively or negatively.

Given these considerations, it is hypothesized that;

Hypothesis 1: Native U.S. teachers (employing English as a first language) will produce more positive classroom outcomes than non-native U.S. teachers (employing English as a second language).

Sub-hypothesis 1: Native U.S. teachers will produce higher motivation toward the course than non-native U.S. teachers.

Sub-hypothesis 2: Native U.S. teachers will produce higher affect toward the instructor than non-native U.S. teachers.

Sub-hypothesis 3: Native U.S. teachers will produce higher affect toward the course content than non-native U.S. teachers.

Sub-hypothesis 4: Native U.S. teachers will produce behavioral intent to take another similar course than non-native U.S. teachers.

Sub-hypothesis 5: Native U.S. teachers will produce higher willingness to communicate in the classroom context among students than non-native U.S. teachers.

Sub-hypothesis 6: Students will rate overall native U.S. teacher effectiveness higher than non-native U.S. teacher effectiveness.

Sub-hypothesis 7: Native U.S. teachers will produce higher perceptions of learning than non-native U.S. teachers.

Sub-hypothesis 8: Students will perceive greater learning loss for non-native U.S. teachers than for native U.S. teachers.

Not only are certain characteristics of our attitudes predictive of our behavior, Gudykunst (1995) asserts that our attitudes toward strangers affect how we interpret their behavior: "When our attitudes are rigid, we tend to be intolerant of other viewpoints, we tend to be resistant to change, and we try to ward off threatening aspects of our social environments" (p. 25). Ethnocentrism is one example of a rigid attitude that affects our communication with strangers. Holding rigid attitudes creates negative expectations for our interactions with strangers (Gudykunst, 1995). Stephan and Stephan (1985, 1989) report that the more ethnocentric we are, the more anxiety we experience with strangers. Gudykunst (1995, p. 25) points out that "when we hold rigid attitudes and have negative expectations, we also do not look for new information about strangers with whom we interact. Holding rigid attitudes, therefore, decreases our ability to accurately predict strangers' behavior." To summarize, rigid attitudes (e.g., ethnocentrism) inhibit the likelihood that people will reduce uncertainty (in that information is not sought) and decreases in an ability to accurately predict strangers' behavior increases anxiety.

Gudykunst (1988) explains the relationship between reducing uncertainty and anxiety by first asserting that each are independent aspects of the communication process. He differentiates uncertainty reduction (social cognitive process) and anxiety reduction (affective process) in arguing that the influence of social cognitive processes (uncertainty reduction) is mediated through behavioral intentions and the influence of affective processes (anxiety) is not. He states that "it is possible for strangers to reduce uncertainty, but still have high levels of anxiety and vice-versa" (p. 126).

McCroskey and Richmond (1995) point out a similar relationship between communication apprehension (affective process) and willingness to communicate (behavioral intentions). Willingness to communicate denotes behavioral intentions (i.e., indicates approach-avoidance tendencies). The assumption is that people who report high levels of trait and state willingness tend to behave consistently by seeking information. Therefore, willingness to communicate mediates uncertainty reduction, but may not reduce anxiety; and it is possible for a person to have a high willingness to communicate and experience high levels of anxiety (and vice-versa). However, McCroskey and Richmond (1995) report that one of the best predictors of willingness to communicate is communication apprehension. Therefore, as is generally true for the positive relationship between uncertainty and anxiety, levels of state communication apprehension should be inversely related to state levels of willingness to communicate.

Lukens' (1978) notion of ethnocentrism and social distance is also relevant to the reduction of uncertainty and approach-avoidance tendencies. As previously explained, Gudykunst (1991) states that there is an association between high degree of ethnocentrism and the distance of disparagement and the moderate degree of ethnocentrism and the distance of avoidance. In that social distance reflects the same approach-avoidance continuum as the willingness to communicate construct (i.e., high ethnocentrism/social distance reflects tendencies to avoid, low willingness to communicate reflects tendencies to avoid) and indicates the same general tendency to reduce uncertainty (i.e., low degree of ethnocentrism reflects an openness to new information; high willingness to communicate suggests a tendency to approach or seek information), there should be a relationship between state and trait measures of each.

As was previously indicated, Brophy (1986) suggests that state motivation is likely to decrease in situations marked with anxiety. As intercultural contexts tend to be more anxiety arousing, it is likely that student state motivation levels will be lower in classes taught by non-native teachers than by native U.S. teachers. Further, there may be an association between state motivation levels and willingness to communicate.

Researchers (Andersen, 1979a; Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Burgoon, 1978; Gudykunst, 1988, 1995; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1988; McCroskey & Richmond, 1997; Neulip &

McCroskey, 1997) suggest that attitudes, similarity, expectations, knowledge, and anxiety each play a role in how individuals interpret and evaluate others' behaviors and messages. In the current study, the interest is to discover how such factors are related to each other and how predictive such factors are of perceived teacher effectiveness. Based on the current conceptualizations and operationalizations of student perceived teacher effectiveness (student perceived optimal learning, learning loss, overall teacher effectiveness rating, affective, cognitive, and behavioral learning), anxiety (intercultural communication apprehension), attitude toward dissimilar others (ethnocentrism), information approach-avoidance (trait and classroom willingness to communicate), and motivation (general student motivation and situation specific motivation), the following research question is posed:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between student willingness to communicate, ethnocentrism, intercultural communication apprehension, general motivation, and classroom willingness to communicate and perceptions of native U.S. and non-native U.S. teacher effectiveness?

Methods and Procedures

Sample

The participants in this study were U.S. native (speak English as a native language) undergraduate volunteers drawn from introductory communication classes at a moderate sized university. A total of 316 undergraduate students were utilized in this study. Only data collected from U.S. native undergraduates who had been instructed by both an international (non-native U.S. employing English as a second language) and an American (native U.S. employing English as a first language) teacher (faculty or graduate teaching assistant) in the past year were considered for final data analysis. Students who did not meet this criteria were excused from the study. 112 of the 316 surveys collected were not considered in the data analysis because they did not meet the criteria of the study (i.e., 36 were completed by non-native U.S. students, 23 were incomplete, 4 described American teachers whose native language was not English, and 49 described international teachers whose native language was English), and therefore 204 surveys were utilized for this study (N = 118 males, N = 86 females). The average age of the respondents was 21.3 (N = 66 seniors, N = 49 juniors, N = 83 sophomores, N = 4 freshmen, N = 2 postgraduates). The surveys were completed in introductory communication courses/general education classes during the second week of the fall semester. The average number of non-native U.S. teachers previously taken by the respondents was 2.47, with a minimum of one and a maximum of nine. The students identified 204 non-native U.S. teachers' (N = 131 males, N = 73 females) countries/regions of origin to be Asia (N = 91), Europe (N = 40), Latin America (N = 40), East India (N = 14), Africa (N = 11), and "Other" (N = 13, e.g., Middle East). The respondents also identified 204 native U.S. teachers' (N = 136 males, N = 68 females) ethnic background (N = 190 Caucasian, N = 4 African, non-Hispanic, N = 4 Hispanic, N = 3 Asian-American, N = 1 Native American, N = 1 East Indian, N = 1 Italian).

Procedures

Administration of the questionnaires was conducted in one phase. In the first section of the questionnaire packet, participants filled out versions of the Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension (PRICA), General Ethnocentrism Scale, additional ethnocentrism items, Willingness to Communicate (WTC), a general measure of Willingness to Communicate in the classroom context, and a general Student Motivation Scale. At the end of this section of the questionnaire, each participant was asked to indicate whether their own native language was English, the number of international teachers they have had at their current institution, and their own country of origin. In part two of the survey, participants indicated the country of origin for their most recent international teacher (non-native to the U.S) and whether this teacher's native

language was English. Each participant then responded to questionnaire items in this section of the survey with reference to the specified non-native U.S. teacher and the class and course that was taught by this teacher. The participants filled out measures of willingness to communicate in the classroom context, motivation in the classroom, affect toward course content, affect toward teacher, behavioral likelihood of enrolling in a similar class, amount of learning, amount of learning loss, and over all teacher effectiveness. In part three of the survey, participants indicated the country of origin for their most recent American teacher (native to the U.S) and whether this teacher's native language was English. Each participant then responded to questionnaire items in this section of the survey with reference to the specified native U.S. teacher and the class and course that was taught by this teacher. The participants filled out measures of willingness to communicate in the classroom context, motivation in the classroom, affect toward course content, affect toward teacher, behavioral likelihood of enrolling in a similar class, amount of learning, amount of learning loss, and over all teacher effectiveness.

Measurement

This section describes the instruments that were used to measure the dependent and independent variables of the study. For the research hypothesis and sub-hypotheses, the dependent variable is student perceptions of teacher effectiveness. The independent variable is teacher origin—native U.S. or non-native U.S. For the research question in this study, the predictor variables are approach-avoidance (willingness to communicate and classroom willingness to communicate), attitude toward dissimilar others (ethnocentrism), anxiety (intercultural communication apprehension), and motivation (general motivation). The criterion (dependent) variable is student perceived teacher effectiveness (learning, learning loss, overall effectiveness, willingness to communicate in the classroom, affect toward content, affect toward instructor, and behavioral commitment to take another class).

Student perceived teacher effectiveness. The dependent variable, student perceived teacher effectiveness, is operationalized by utilizing measures developed to assess the three domains of learning: cognitive, affective, and behavioral (Andersen, 1979a; Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957; Richmond, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1987). Teacher effectiveness is operationally defined as one who produces positive outcomes in all three domains of learning: positive student affect, behavioral commitment, and student cognitive learning, as well as motivation, willingness to communicate in the classroom context.

Hypothesis 1: Native U.S. teachers (employing English as a first language) will produce more positive classroom outcomes than non-native U.S. teachers (employing English as a second language). Positive classroom outcomes was measured by each of the eight sub-hypotheses and examined cumulatively.

For Sub-hypothesis 1: Native U.S. teachers will produce higher motivation toward the course than non-native U.S. teachers, trait motivation toward classes in general and state motivation toward the specific teacher and course on which students reported were measured using Richmond's (1990) five-item Student Motivation Scale (SMS). Richmond's scale, which is an extension of the Beatty, Forst, and Stewart (1986) measure, consists of five, seven-step bipolar adjectives. Alpha reliability has been reported to be .94 (Richmond, 1990).

Affective learning is operationalized in two different ways in this study. For Sub-hypothesis 2: Native U.S. teachers will produce higher affect toward the instructor than non-native U.S. teachers and Sub-hypothesis 3: Native U.S. teachers will produce higher affect toward the course content than non-native U.S. teachers, student affect toward the subject matter or content of the course and affect toward the course instructor were independently assessed. Four seven-step evaluative semantic differential scales (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957) were utilized to assess affect for both course and teacher. These semantic differentials have been used repeatedly by researchers examining teacher effectiveness (cf. Andersen, 1978; Kearney &

McCroskey, 1980; Richmond, 1990). Richmond (1990) reports alpha reliability of the scale to be .96.

In order to assess the perceptions of behavioral learning for Sub-hypothesis 4: Native U.S. teachers will produce behavioral intent to take another similar course than non-native U.S. teachers, one measure of behavioral commitment was used: the likelihood of actually enrolling in another course of related content is a schedule so permits. Four evaluative semantic differential scales were chosen for these measures: likely/unlikely, possible, impossible, probable/improbable, and would/would not. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975, p. 372) report research that suggests that behavioral intentions are the immediate determinants of the corresponding overt behaviors. They argue that this relationship is not a perfect one, but when appropriate methodology is used, it is highly predictive. Thus, according to Andersen (1979a, p. 549), "behavioral commitment measures can be used as reasonable predictors of future student behaviors."

In Andersen's (1979a) study, behavioral commitment was operationalized as the likelihood of enrolling in another course of related content. The internal reliability coefficient alpha for the semantic differential measures was .86.

For Sub-hypothesis 5: Native U.S. teachers will produce higher willingness to communicate in the classroom context among students than non-native U.S. teachers, to measure willingness to communicate (WTC) in the classroom context, a modified version of Chan's (1988) scale was used. In her study Chan (1988) found the correlation of the total WTC score with a score on an instrument she developed to measure college student respondents' willingness to communicate in a classroom context was .70 (.80 corrected for attenuation). An adapted version of Chan's (1988) items are used to identify state willingness to communicate (by teacher type) in the current study.

For Sub-hypothesis 6: Students will rate overall native U.S. teacher effectiveness higher than non-native U.S. teacher effectiveness, a one-item measure was used which asked the students to rate on a seven point scale the overall effectiveness of the teacher in each of the two teacher conditions. This item was incorporated as a method of combining the affective, behavioral, and cognitive learning components consistent with the operationalization of perceived teacher effectiveness in this study.

For Sub-hypothesis 7: Native U.S. teachers will produce higher perceptions of learning than non-native U.S. teachers, and for Sub-hypothesis 8: Students will perceive greater learning loss for non-native U.S. teachers than for native U.S. teachers, student perceptions of cognitive learning were measured using Richmond, Gorham, and McCroskey's (1987) cognitive learning measure. The measure asks students to indicate (on a scale of 0 - 9) how much they feel they learned in the class on which they are reporting and how much they believe they could have learned had they had an ideal instructor. Scores from item one are subtracted from item two to obtain a "learning loss" score.

Since these two cognitive learning instruments are single-item scales, no alpha reliability estimates are possible. However, "in a pilot test employing only U.S. subjects (n=162), the test-retest reliability of the learning and learning loss scores over a five day period were .85 and .88, respectively" (McCroskey et. al., 1995, p. 9).

Measurement of Predictor Variables

The research question in this study poses the question: What is the relationship between willingness to communicate, ethnocentrism, intercultural communication apprehension, general motivation, and classroom willingness to communicate and perceptions of native U.S. and non-native U.S. teacher effectiveness? In order to measure the predictor variables associated with the Research Question of this study, the predictor variables in this study are defined as anxiety, attitude toward dissimilar others, information approach-avoidance, and motivation. The

measurement of the dependent (criterion) variable, student perceived teacher effectiveness, was described above for each of the sub-hypotheses.

Anxiety. Neulip and McCroskey (1997) report that there are cognitive, affective, and behavioral components to anxiety. "In its cognitive domain, anxiety is a state of heightened self-awareness, perceived helplessness, and expectations of negative outcomes. Affectively, anxiety manifests itself as subjective feelings of discomfort, distress and fear. The behavior of the anxious individual tends to become hesitant, inhibited, and sometimes disrupted (Leary, 1982; 1990)" (p. 4).

Conceptually, intercultural communication apprehension (ICA) represents a context of communication marked with unusually high uncertainty. Such uncertainty leads to high anxiety; a causal ingredient in communication apprehension. Intercultural communication contexts are consistent with Buss's (1980) argument that the salient situational features leading to increased anxiety include novelty, unfamiliarity, and dissimilarity. The Personal Report of Intercultural Anxiety (PRICA; Neulip & McCroskey, 1997), evolved from this conceptualization of intercultural communication in order to facilitate research in this area of study. Thus, anxiety is measured in this study by the PRICA scale.

Each of the 14 items on the PRICA deal with communication with people from different cultures. In Neulip and McCroskey's (1997) research, reliability of this measure as indexed by Cronbach's alpha was quite high; .941 (PRICA). Further, these researchers found support for the conclusion that the PRICA is predictive of actual communicative behavior. That is, the scale was shown to be predictive of the frequency of contact with people from a different country.

Information approach-avoidance. The measure of the approach-avoidance construct is the "Willingness To Communicate" scale (WTC; McCroskey & Richmond, 1985; 1987). The WTC scale is a 20-item, probability estimate scale. The scale was designed as a direct measure of the respondent's predisposition toward approaching or avoiding the initiation of communication.

The 20 items, minus eight dummy variables, on the scale represent the crossing of three types of receivers with four types of communication contexts. Studies conducted by McCroskey and colleagues have found the estimates of internal reliability of the total score on the instrument range from .86 to .95, with a modal estimate of .92. Therefore, the 20-item WTC scale was used to measure general approach-avoidance. Further, the categories for receiver and context types are assumed to be broadly representative. In a study by Chan (1988), the correlation of the total WTC score with a score on an instrument she developed to measure college student respondents' willingness to communicate in a classroom context was .70 (.80 corrected for attenuation). An adapted version of Chan's (1988) items are used to identify state, or classroom willingness to communicate in the current study.

General Motivation. Trait motivation toward classes in general was measured using Richmond's (1990) five-item Student Motivation Scale (SMS). Richmond's scale, which is an extension of the Beatty, Forst, and Stewart (1986) measure, consists of five, seven-step bipolar adjectives. Alpha reliability has been reported to be .94 (Richmond, 1990).

Attitude Toward Dissimilar Others. Two measures of ethnocentrism and one additional item were combined for use in the present study to measure students' attitudes toward dissimilar others. The first measure used was a five-item self-report scale adapted from Brewer's (1981) description of ethnocentrism by Gudykunst (1991). This measure asks respondents to indicate the degree in which each statement is true or false with regard to how they think about themselves. This measure has not been used in past research and therefore reliability estimates are unknown. An additional item was included with the original five, which asked about the number of friends from different cultures that the respondents considered to be friends.

The second measure of ethnocentrism was developed by Neulip and McCroskey (1997). The General Ethnocentrism Scale is composed of 24 items, with the first 12 items being paired mates of the second 12 items. The latter items have shown a .90 reliability.

Data Analyses

Preliminary analyses were conducted to determine the reliability of each multi-item measure (the cognitive learning, learning loss, and effectiveness measures are single-item measures, hence no internal reliability estimates were possible for these instruments). The internal reliability of the scales was estimated with Cronbach's alpha (Carmines & Zeller, 1979).

Descriptive statistics were obtained for all of the independent and dependent variables in the study. In order to test the major hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses, two-correlated-sample t-tests were performed on the difference scores computed between participants' ratings of the native U.S. and non-native U.S. teachers for the following eight variables: willingness to communicate with the class instructor, motivation toward the class, affect toward the content in the course, evaluation of the teacher, behavioral intent to take a similar class, effectiveness of the teacher, learning, and learning loss. Although the significance level set for each test of the directional sub-hypotheses was alpha = .05, the sample size (N = 204) provided sufficient power to detect very small significant differences. Therefore, only meaningful differences (those significant at alpha = .001 level) found for the planned comparisons were considered for discussion. A two-correlated-sample t-test was also computed on the difference scores between the native U.S. and non-native U.S. teachers on the perception of possible learning from an ideal teacher. The alpha level of significance was set at .05. This provided a test of the assumption that perceptions of an ideal teacher should not differ as a function of the nature of the real teacher in the class.

In order to test Hypothesis 1: Native U.S. teachers (employing English as a first language) will produce more positive classroom outcomes than non-native U.S. teachers (employing English as a second language), the overall mean score, standard deviation, and t-score for each of the eight sub-hypotheses were compared by teacher type (native U.S. and non-native U.S.).

Correlational analyses were employed in order to explore the Research Question: What is the relationship between student willingness to communicate, ethnocentrism, intercultural communication apprehension, general motivation, and classroom willingness to communicate and perceptions of native U.S. and non-native U.S. teacher effectiveness? Simple correlations were computed to determine the relationships of five individual difference variables (willingness to communicate, willingness to communicate in the classroom, ethnocentrism, intercultural communication apprehension, and general motivation toward classes) with each of the eight outcome variables (learning, overall effectiveness, learning loss, willingness to communicate, motivation in the classroom, affect toward content, affect toward instructor, behavioral intent to take a similar class). Alpha was set at .05 for the analyses. Stepwise regression analyses were employed to determine which predictor variables accounted for unique variance in each outcome variable. The best model was chosen for each of the eight forward selection procedures when no other variable both met the .5000 significance level for entry into the model and provided significant (alpha = .05) additional accounted variance.

Results

Preliminary analyses were conducted to obtain reliability estimates for the measures. Alpha reliability estimates for each measure are reported in Table 1. For the most part the reliability estimates obtained in this study were generally similar to those reported in earlier research. The only measures which were problematic were the two ethnocentrism instruments. The initial analyses indicated alpha reliabilities of only .69 for each measure. Consequently, the two instruments were combined, along with one additional item which was added to the Gudykunst (1991) measure (I have many friends from different countries). The reliability of the combined ethnocentrism measure (.83) was much more satisfactory. However, four items from the Neulip and McCroskey (1997) measure were found not to contribute to the reliability of the

combined instrument. After deleting these items, the final instrument employed fourteen items. The present research employed only 12 of the 24 items in the Neulip and McCroskey instrument.

Table 2 reports descriptive statistics for each individual difference measure. The obtained means, standard deviations, and ranges were consistent with those obtained in previous research.

Descriptive statistics for the dependent variables in this research, broken down by teacher type (native U.S. or non-native U.S.), are reported in Table 3. Simple correlations between scores for the two teacher types for each dependent variable are also reported in Table 3. As would be expected, the correlations for the two more trait-like measures (willingness to communicate with the teacher and potential for learning with an ideal teacher) were high. However, the correlations for the seven more situational measures were very low and mostly non-significant. These results suggest that students in this study were responding very specifically to the different teachers rather than on a general trait basis.

Consistent with the hypothesis that students would respond more favorably to native U.S. teachers than to non-native U.S. teachers, two-correlated-sample t-tests (reported in Table 3) revealed significant differences on each of the dependent variables with the exception of the measure of perceived learning possible from an ideal teacher. The difference between the two teacher types on the measure of the ideal teacher was appropriately not significant ($t < 1$). As hypothesized, the overall means for each of the sub-hypotheses were higher for the native U.S. teachers. The standard deviations were also lower for each of the dependent measures of teacher effectiveness for the native U.S. teachers.

Sub-hypothesis 1 was supported. Native U.S. teachers produced significantly higher motivation toward the course than non-native U.S. teachers ($t = 6.29$, $p < .0001$). By comparing the mean scores for the native U.S. teachers ($M = 29.6$, $SD = 4.8$) and the non-native U.S. teachers ($M = 26.3$, $SD = 6.2$), these results indicate that the students were 12.5% more motivated to learn in the classes taught by U.S. teachers.

Sub-hypothesis 2 was supported. Native U.S. teachers significantly produced higher affect toward the instructor than non-native U.S. teachers ($t = 11.60$, $p < .0001$). Comparisons of the mean scores for the native U.S. teachers ($M = 23$, $SD = 4.9$) and the non-native U.S. teachers ($M = 20.5$, $SD = 5.8$) indicate that students had 14.1% more positive affect for the U.S. teachers.

Sub-hypothesis 3 was supported. Native U.S. teachers produced significantly higher affect toward the course content ($t = 4.52$, $p < .0001$) than non-native U.S. teachers. Further, the scores for affect toward course content by teacher type were significantly correlated at .16, $p < .05$. Comparison of mean scores for native U.S. teachers ($M = 23.1$, $SD = 4.3$) and non-native U.S. teachers ($M = 21.1$, $SD = 5.0$) indicate that the students had 9.0% more positive affect for the content that U.S. teachers taught.

Consistent with sub-hypothesis 4, students reported significantly greater likelihood to enroll in a similar class taught by native U.S. teachers than for classes taught by non-native U.S. teachers ($t = 4.29$, $p < .0001$). Comparison of the mean scores for the native U.S. teachers ($M = 21.0$, $SD = 7.0$) and non-native U.S. teachers ($M = 17.7$, $SD = 8.3$) indicate that the behavioral intent to take another similar course was 18.6% more likely for students in classes taught by native U.S. teachers.

Sub-hypothesis 5 was supported. Native U.S. teachers produced significantly higher willingness to communicate in the classroom context among students than non-native U.S. teachers ($t = 5.16$, $p < .0001$). The results indicated a strong, significant correlation between the scores by teacher type ($r = .57$, $p < .0001$). Further, students were found to be 17.8% more willing to communicate in the classroom context taught by native U.S. teachers ($M = 64.1$, $SD = 30.0$) than those contexts taught by non-native U.S. teachers ($M = 54.4$, $SD = 30.0$).

Support was also provided for Sub-hypothesis 6. Students significantly rated overall native U.S. teacher effectiveness higher than non-native U.S. overall teacher effectiveness ($t = 7.50$, $p < .0001$). There was a significant, negative correlation between the scores by teacher type

($r = -.14$, $p > .05$). The results also indicate that native U.S. teachers ($M = 5.8$, $SD = 1.3$) were 26.1% more effective than non-native U.S. teachers ($M = 4.6$, $SD = 1.8$).

Sub-hypothesis 7 was supported. Native U.S. teachers produced significantly higher perceptions of learning than non-native U.S. teachers ($t = 7.78$, $p < .0001$). The results also indicate that students perceived to learn 25.5% more from the native U.S. teachers ($M = 6.9$, $SD = 1.6$) than the non-native U.S. teachers ($M = 1.4$, $SD = 2.6$).

Sub-hypothesis 8 was supported. Students perceived significantly greater learning loss in classes taught by non-native U.S. teachers ($t = 7.08$, $p < .0001$). Students reported a substantial and significant 171.4% more learning loss as a function of non-native U.S. teachers ($M = 1.9$, $SD = 2.0$) as compared to native U.S. teachers ($M = .7$, $SD = 1.1$).

A paramount concern of this research was the determination of the degree to which specific student traits would predict their differential reactions to native U.S. and non-native U.S. teachers. The simple correlations reported in Table 4 indicate that some student traits are associated with their responses to teachers, and some are not. More specifically, neither general willingness to communicate nor willingness to communicate in the classroom context were found to be significantly correlated with any of the differential perceptions students reported for native U.S. and non-native U.S. teachers. In contrast, student level of ethnocentrism was significantly positively correlated with the perceived differences between teacher types on each of the measures obtained in this study. These correlations indicated shared variance ranging between 4 percent (for willingness to take another class) and 10 percent (for affect for instructor). These positive associations with difference scores indicate that more ethnocentric U.S. students tend to evaluate native U.S. teachers more favorably than non-native U.S. teachers.

As noted in Table 4, students' general motivation in the classroom was found to be significant and negatively correlated to the difference in measures of willingness to communicate in the classroom and motivation in the classroom. Students with higher general levels of motivation toward learning were somewhat more willing to communicate in classes with non-native U.S. teachers and were somewhat more motivated in those classes. Each of these correlations indicated about 4 percent of shared variance.

The students' level of intercultural communication apprehension was found to be significantly negatively correlated with differences in perceived learning loss, willingness to communicate in the classroom, affect toward content, affect toward instructor, and behavioral indication of taking a similar class. These positive associations with intercultural communication apprehension indicate that more apprehensive students rated non-native U.S. teachers somewhat more negatively than they rated the native U.S. teachers. The magnitude of these relationships was low, representing 4 percent or less in shared variance.

A series of stepwise regression analyses were conducted to determine whether the observed predictability of the five individual difference variables (ethnocentrism, intercultural communication apprehension, general motivation, willingness to communicate, and classroom willingness to communicate) was additive or redundant. Tables 5-12 summarize the best model for each criterion variable.

For the criterion variable, Learning Difference (Table 5), the two variable model included two predictors which provided 8% of unique variance, $F(2, 201) = 8.36$, $p = .0003$. Ethnocentrism accounted for 6% of the total variance, while willingness to communicate added an additional 2%.

The one variable model was determined to be the best for the outcome variable, Overall Effectiveness (Table 6). Ethnocentrism was the only significant predictor, accounting for 6% unique variance, $F(1, 202) = 12.86$, $p = .0004$.

For Learning Loss differences (Table 7), student ethnocentrism accounted for 5% unique variance, $F(1, 202) = 11.63$, $p = .0008$. No other predictor variables significantly added additional variance.

Table 8 summarizes the best model for differences in student Willingness to Communicate. The two variable model included two predictors which provided unique variance, $F(2, 201) = 10.51$, $p = .0001$. Ethnocentrism accounted for 5% of unique variance, while general motivation added an additional 4%.

For differences in student Classroom Motivation (Table 9), the two variable model included ethnocentrism and general motivation as providing 9% of total variance, $F(2, 201) = 10.02$, $p = .0001$. Ethnocentrism accounted for 7% of the variance and an additional 2% of variance was added from the predictor variable general motivation.

Table 10 reports differences in Affect Toward Content. Ethnocentrism accounted for the total 7% unique variance for differences in student affect toward course content, $F(1, 202) = 15.95$, $p = .0001$.

The differences for Affect Toward Instructor are reported in Table 11. The one variable model included ethnocentrism as a significant predictor of student affect for instructor difference, $F(1, 202) = 22.77$, $p = .0001$, accounting for 10% of unique variance.

The one variable model summarized in Table 12 includes ethnocentrism as the only significant predictor of the differences for student Behavioral Intent to take a similar course, $F(1, 202) = 8.94$, $p = .0031$. Unique variance accounted for by student ethnocentrism was 4%.

These regression analyses revealed that student level of ethnocentrism was the first predictor included in all models, accounting for 4-10 percent of variance. Intercultural communication apprehension never entered any model. This indicates that this predictor was wholly redundant with ethnocentrism in all of the models generated. General motivation entered the regression models for willingness to communicate in the class and motivation in the class as a second predictor, accounting for an additional 2-3 percent of the variance.

Although these correlational and regression results indicate that we may be able to attribute up to 10 percent of the variability in differences in student perceptions of native U.S. and non-native U.S. teachers to student predispositions, the remaining 90 percent of the variance is best characterized to be a function of the differential behaviors of native U.S. and non-native U.S teachers. Thus, while student bias in the form of ethnocentrism appears to be a factor influencing perceptions of teacher effectiveness, the magnitude of the effects observed in the present study suggests that true differences in teacher effectiveness are most likely the primary causes of these perceived differences.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine whether measures of students' traits and state orientations are predictive of how students will evaluate culturally similar and dissimilar teachers. I advanced one general hypothesis and one research question; both focused on the degree to which non-native U.S. teachers and native U.S. teachers are perceived by students and examined reasons for these differential perceptions. Overall, one can conclude with regard to Hypothesis 1, "Native U.S. teachers (employing English as a first language) will produce more positive classroom outcomes than non-native U.S. teachers (employing English as a second language)," that students in general perceive native U.S. teachers more favorably than non-native U.S. teachers. The results of the t-tests support the assertion that students evaluate native U.S. and non-native U.S. teachers significantly differently.

The results of Hypothesis 1 are consistent with Brewer and Campbell's (1976) review of UNESCO studies of national stereotypes with regard to cultural similarity and evaluation bias. These researchers found a similar relationship to hold for the evaluation of culturally dissimilar outgroups that was found for evaluations of classroom outcomes for culturally dissimilar teachers in the present investigation. That is, more culturally similar persons are more favorably evaluated, whereas dissimilar others are more negatively evaluated.

Possible reasons that the results of this investigation are consistent with those expected for the hypothesis and sub-hypotheses can be discussed individually. As hypothesized, situational factors appear to influence student perceptions of teacher effectiveness. Thus, the nature of the context of communication, intercultural or intracultural, presents an additional consideration for students in their evaluation of teacher effectiveness. The discussion of the sub-hypotheses in this investigation will therefore center on possible reasons for the results, supported by various theories, that differentiate the nature of the intracultural and intercultural contexts. Likewise, the results pertaining to the research question will be discussed in terms of similar results supported by past research.

For sub-hypothesis 1, Native U.S. teachers will produce higher motivation toward the course than non-native U.S. teachers, a review of how motivation has been conceptualized is helpful. Brophy (1986) conceptualized student motivation as both a trait, which is an enduring disposition to value learning, and as a state which is situation specific. Brophy (1986) contends that a precondition for motivation is an environment that does not increase students' anxieties, because "anxious or alienated students are unlikely to develop motivation to learn academic content" (p. 19). Further, Brophy suggests that state motivation is likely to decrease in situations marked with anxiety. Thus, lower levels of state motivation found in non-native U.S. classrooms in the present investigation can be argued to be a function of the intercultural situation. Past research supports this contention. Buss (1980) argues that some of the salient situational features that increase anxiety in communication environments include dissimilarity, unfamiliarity, and novelty. In the present investigation the students' evaluations of non-native U.S. teachers may have been a reaction to the dissimilarity of cultural background, unfamiliarity with the others' culture, and novelty of interacting with a non-native U.S. teacher.

Past research has also indicated possible reasons for increased state motivation in the classroom. Such positive associations should be connected with the idea that certain teacher behaviors and other contextual factors do not escalate the anxiety level for students in these instructional contexts, and may to some extent aid in the reduction of anxiety. Weaver and Cottrell (1988), for example, state that in terms of increasing state motivation, students indicated a preference for interesting subjects, instructor enthusiasm, exciting approaches, relevance of class to one's own life, and the incorporation of humor in the classroom. Christophel (1990) and Richmond (1990) also found that students who have a positive perception of the immediacy behaviors being used in the classroom experience higher levels of motivation to study. Frymier (1992) states that teachers' increased use of affinity-seeking strategies are positively associated with increases in students' state motivation to study. Research by Thomas (1995) found that students' perception of teacher assertiveness and responsiveness in terms of socio-communicative style worked together in producing student motivation for the class.

Research by Frymier (1993) examined the relationship between anxiety, motivation, and expectancies. The results of her study revealed that state motivation decreased as communication apprehension increased. Based on Brophy's (1986, 1987) assertion that whether students are motivated in part depends on expectancies and on rewards, she summated that students who exhibit high communication apprehension "may not expect to do as well on a task or expect to receive as many rewards based on previous experience with teachers and/or their own performance, and therefore not be as motivated to study for a class" (p. 14).

The expectancy theory can help to elaborate reasons why such relationships have been found in the research cited above. "Expectations involve looking forward or anticipating something (positive or negative) in the future" (Gudykunst, 1988, p. 130). Expectations are formed based in part on our knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, stereotypes, and norms. These expectations are used to make predictions for others' behaviors and are also used to evaluate and assess the appropriateness, or valence, of the behaviors (i.e., which behaviors are favorable or unfavorable). Behaviors which are expectation confirming and positively valenced are assessed more positively than expectations that are expectation confirming or disconfirming and

negatively valenced (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). In terms of the present investigation, students' expectations for classroom situations are based on normative behaviors and preferences surrounding the context. The preference for immediate, responsive, and assertive teacher behaviors are positively valenced and expected, and therefore assessed more favorably. One caveat regarding this statement that should be emphasized is that these preferences may only be associated with native U.S. teachers, and that similar behaviors from non-native U.S. teachers may not be expected and/or may not be positively valenced from the perspective of native U.S. students. In this type of situation, the expectancy violation may serve to heighten anxiety due to the awareness that one's predictions are incorrect.

Research by Simard (1981) revealed that individuals are less confident in predicting behavior of culturally dissimilar individuals. According to research by Stephan and Stephan (1984), perceived cultural dissimilarity increases anxiety due to the lack of knowledge regarding the prediction of other group members behaviors. Therefore, anxiety can stem not only from undesirable behaviors but also from behaviors that are not expected (i.e., negatively valenced or expectation disconfirming).

In the above discussion of reasons why students' state motivation was higher in the intracultural context, similarity was offered as a primary factor which could predict the relationship between social knowledge and decreased anxiety. Witte's (1991) research supports the idea that the ability to accurately predict others' behavior and provide reasons for the behavior (attributional confidence) is inversely related to anxiety. This position states that there is a relationship between social knowledge and our expectancies. People who are similar with respect to culture and language tend to be more confident in their prediction making activities. That is, people expect others who are similar to exhibit normative behavior by standards from their own cultural group (ingroup behavior), and those who are dissimilar to exhibit stereotypical behaviors associated with groups other than their own group (outgroup behavior). Anxiety which inhibits state motivation can be associated with the inability to match expectations with other behavior, or the reaction to behaviors that are negatively perceived even though expectancy confirming.

Byrne's (1971) research on the similarity-attraction hypothesis suggests that people are attracted to those who are similar. Sub-hypothesis 2 indicates that people who are similar in respect to culture appear to have greater affinity for one another. Further, it is likely that people who are perceived as familiar or similar do not cause discomfort in the form of heightened anxiety in others, and therefore, are shown preference when compared to dissimilar others. As defined for this investigation, an intracultural communication context is one in which the participants share the same native culture and language. In accordance, then, native U.S. teachers operate in an intracultural communication context and non-native U.S. teachers operate in an intercultural communication context. It can be reasoned that students report greater positive affect toward the teacher in a non-threatening and familiar situation such as the intracultural context where uncertainty is low in comparison to the intercultural context.

Research by Prisbell (1985) examined the relationships between student uncertainty level, affect (satisfaction), classroom learning and evaluations. He asserts that increase in the amount of communication exchanged between the instructor and students in the classroom (during a given semester) may be explained by the concept of communication satisfaction--the presence or absence of affect at the conclusion of an interaction (Hecht, 1978). Prisbell (1985) reasons that "when communication is satisfying to students, the amount of communication exchanged increases, thus, reducing uncertainty" (p. 91). As noted previously, the relationship between attraction and social knowledge is not unfamiliar. Further, the relationship between high levels of uncertainty and increased levels of anxiety has also been noted. The uncertainty reduction theory as originally formulated by Berger and Calabrese (1975) postulated that in initial interactions partner's liking was interrelated with similarity, uncertainty, reciprocity, intimacy, level of communication content, amount of communication, and nonverbal affiliative expressiveness. The uncertainty principle is based upon the idea that uncertainty levels are high

during initial encounters because prediction of future behavior is difficult and no knowledge factors have been exchanged. In terms of satisfaction, or affect, increased information seeking in the form of increased interaction provides higher attributional confidence and familiarity. Prisbell's (1985) investigation revealed that low levels of uncertainty were related to high student satisfaction, and that students who "felt good about themselves were communicatively satisfied with their instructors, had gained knowledge about the instructor throughout the semester, and responded positively in the areas of classroom learning and evaluations" (p. 95).

Brewer and Campbell (1976) reported that although there was no evidence to support the notion of a favorability bias in outgroup evaluation based on familiarity on the individual level, that individual social distance ratings "may reflect each respondent's perceptions of what the ingroup's norms are relative to each outgroup and thus provide a better indication of how attraction mediates evaluation" (p. 105).

One proponent of the idea that greater similarity creates the likelihood of approach behaviors is Rokeach (1960) who argues that the degree of similarity between two people is the primary factor in social distance. Research by H. K. Kim (1991) suggests that perceived attitudinal similarity is a stronger predictor of attraction to dissimilar others than perceived competence in the native language. Berger and Calabrese's (1975) initial formulation of uncertainty reduction theory examined attraction, or partner's liking, based on constructs related to social distance (e.g. uncertainty and anxiety). Drawing upon the similarity-attraction hypothesis, these researchers suggested that cognitive and attitudinal similarity decrease uncertainty. Gudykunst's (1995) extension of the uncertainty principle included anxiety as the affective equivalent of cognitive uncertainty, and posits that anxiety is an inhibitor of attraction. Kellerman and Reynolds (1990) also reported that high uncertainty (or high anxiety) is an inhibitor of attraction. Thus, social distance as exemplified by avoidance tendencies of those who are anxious and uncertain are indicative of low levels of attraction and aids in the support of the idea that social distance measures may indicate how attraction mediates evaluation.

Lukens (1978) describes social distance in terms of consequences for moderate to high levels of ethnocentrism. Such consequences in terms of attraction are congruent with avoidance rather than approach tendencies of individuals. As supported by Brewer and Campbell's (1976) hypothesis, in the current study, moderate to high levels of ethnocentrism were associated with negative teacher evaluations, and low levels of ethnocentrism were associated with situational approach tendencies.

Sub-hypothesis 5 stated that students would be more willing to communicate in classroom contexts with native U.S. teachers than with non-native U.S. teachers. When examining the approach-avoidance aspect of persons in an interaction, situational factors surrounding intercultural contact, which are characterized by high degrees of anxiety and ambiguity, may serve to inhibit those who are usually willing to approach intracultural communication situations from behaviorally doing so in intercultural interactions (McCroskey, 1992). This idea was supported in the current study.

Kellerman and Reynolds' (1990) research which examined the constant failure of the uncertainty reduction theory to predict information-seeking for those who were anxious or otherwise uncertain also supports this idea. The problem pertaining to the theory's axiom 3 (which states that uncertainty is a stimulus for approach in the form of information-seeking), according to Kellerman and Reynolds (1990) is that the relationship of approach behaviors and high uncertainty is not consistently upheld (i.e., some persons are not motivated to seek information even when faced with high anxiety). Research extending the uncertainty principle by Gudykunst (1995) indicates that other factors such as anxiety and positive expectations also indirectly influence behaviors that reduce uncertainty. He asserts that to be effective, one must manage anxiety and uncertainty to the extent that levels of each are neither too high nor too low.

In Berger's (1979) elaboration of the uncertainty reduction theory, three information gathering strategy-types were described (passive, active, and interactive). The measure used in

the current analysis to examine approach-avoidance was the willingness to communicate in a classroom setting scale. This measure of situational willingness to communicate taps the direct strategy for seeking information, while ignoring the indirect or passive strategies. As suggested by Gudykunst's (1995) AUM theory, when levels of anxiety and uncertainty are at the extremes (too high or too low), direct information-seeking strategies are less likely to occur.

Once again, support was provided for the Sub-hypothesis 3, native U.S. teachers will produce higher affect toward the course content than non-native U.S. teachers, and Sub-hypothesis 4, native U.S. teachers will produce greater behavioral intent to take another similar course than non-native U.S. teachers. Past research has consistently associated affect for teacher, affect for course content, and behavioral intent to enroll in another class. Intuition would also suggest that if a student likes the teacher, s/he will like the course content, and will indicate that s/he would take another course. Heider's (1946) balance theory suggests that behavior, or behavioral intent, is influenced by our attitudes in a direct manner. So, if a student possesses a general liking for the situation s/he is confronted with, balance theory would suggest that behavior will be consistent with this attitude.

Considerable research in instructional communication that has addressed effective teaching (e.g., Andersen, 1979a; Frymier, 1994; Kearney & McCroskey, 1980; Richmond, 1990) has equated positive student learning with effectiveness (i.e., teacher ability to produce affective, behavioral and cognitive student learning). Like the current investigation, this past research indicates a positive relationship between high effectiveness ratings and affect for content, teacher, and intent to enroll in a similar class among students. In fact, Kearney and McCroskey (1980) report that students' situational, or state-like, anxiety predicts students' affect and behavioral commitment (i.e., high anxiety predicts low affect and behavioral commitment). Therefore, the conclusions reached in this study that the intracultural context (characterized by low anxiety), as exemplified by native U.S. teaching situations, yields higher ratings of overall teacher effectiveness (sub-hypothesis 6), produces greater behavioral intent to enroll (sub-hypothesis 4), and produces higher affect toward the course content (sub-hypothesis 3) are further supported.

With regard to student perceptions of learning (sub-hypothesis 7) and perceived learning loss (sub-hypothesis 8), the results of this study indicate in no uncertain terms that students perceive that they learn more in classes instructed by native U.S. teachers (25.5%) than in classes taught by non-native U.S. teachers. Even more important to this study is that students indicated that in non-native U.S. instructed classes, there was a learning loss of 171.4 percent as compared to the native U.S. instructed classes. The important features of these particular findings is that based on the students' perception of what makes an ideal teacher, they are suffering greater reduction in achieving their learning goals in the intercultural classroom context.

The latter statement is not intended to suggest that all non-native U.S. teachers are ineffective and all native U.S. teachers are effective. Obviously the assumption is that there are factors in these contexts, such as anxiety, uncertainty, and familiarity, which influence how students perceive the teachers. Consistent with statements made by Norton and Nussbaum (1980), though, the results of this investigation do suggest that the good, or effective teachers seem to be perceived as doing something qualitatively different than the poor, or ineffective teachers in terms of communicating. Future research needs to extend examination of situational factors and attempt to determine which teacher behaviors students perceive to be effective, and determine if the behaviors that are most important to perceived effectiveness are the same for both native U.S. and non-native U.S. teachers.

The results of this research indicate that the answer to the research question is that the student orientations examined had some impact on the perceived differences of native U.S. and non-native U.S. teachers' effectiveness. Ethnocentrism was found to be the best predictor (significant for each outcome variable) of perceived teacher effectiveness, although willingness to communicate, intercultural communication apprehension, and general motivation were found to have some impact. The predictive power in intercultural communication apprehension was found

to be colinear with ethnocentrism. This was not surprising. For example, according to Luken's (1978) view of ethnocentrism, the distance of avoidance can be equated to the approach-avoidance measure, willingness to communicate. Likewise, ethnocentrism is said to be a rigidity in attitudes. Such rigidity in attitudes can lead to stereotyping, which can lead to mindless behavior, which has been associated with heightened levels of anxiety. As intercultural communication apprehension is measured as a trait variable, trait ethnocentrism may be at least partially redundant both conceptually and operationally.

The student trait orientations studied in the current investigation, either individually or collectively, were not found to be strong predictors of the differential effectiveness of the native U.S. and non-native U.S. teachers. One reason may, of course, be that the wrong traits were chosen for investigation. While that is a possibility, the intent of this study was to select traits which appeared to be most likely to be related. Therefore, it would appear that the student perceptions probably are not simple manifestations of the students' own traits, but rather reflect true behavioral differences that exist between the native U.S. and non-native U.S. teachers. Most probably the largest element involved is the differential effectiveness with which the two groups of teachers employ the English language. Therefore, working to reduce the ethnocentrism of the students is not likely to have a critical impact on differential perceptions of the teaching effectiveness of native U.S. and non-native U.S. teachers. The solution would appear to be associated with improving the English language competence of the non-native U.S. teachers. Simply put, the non-native U.S. teachers evaluated by the students in this study most likely actually are less effective teachers. This is not just a biased view of ethnocentric students. It is a real problem which calls for approaches which emphasize helping non-native U.S. teachers become more effective communicators in the classroom. This appears to be especially important for teachers who speak with marked English or whose behavior in the classroom is perceived as undesirable, or not as desirable when compared to behaviors expected for effective teachers, by students. If that is not possible, the continued employment of these individuals in U.S. classrooms may need to be reconsidered.

Limitations and Future Research

The present findings are important for at least two reasons. First, the study represents one of the first practical applications designed to test the relationship of attitudes toward others, apprehension, approach-avoidance, classroom teaching, and learning since more recent and valid ethnocentrism and intercultural anxiety measurement indices have been published. Second, because U.S. classrooms have become increasingly diverse, the current research comes at a critical juncture as the United States comes to terms with the issue of cultural diversity.

The significant differences between native and non-native U.S. teacher effectiveness discovered were primary findings, not secondary results from a study designed for another purpose. Likewise, this study set out to determine whether teacher effectiveness ratings could be predicted from specific factors which influence students. The resulting analyses indicate that up to 10 percent of the variability in differences in student perceptions of native and non-native U.S. teachers can be attributed to student predispositions. This finding, although significant, is not nearly as important as the implication that 90 percent of the perceived differences in teacher effectiveness can be argued to result from actual differences in teacher behaviors.

Since teacher effectiveness was examined based on real and recent interactions and not a contrived situation, problems of ecological validity are minimized. Further, problems of generalizability were minimized by sampling representatives from the target group (students).

The above should not be taken to imply there are no shortcomings in the present study. Only native U.S. student perceptions were considered in the analyses of teacher effectiveness. Future research should incorporate those perceptions and factors associated with non-native U.S. students to determine whether the same patterns found in the present investigation exist for other student groups that make up U.S. classrooms. The present investigation also did not consider

surveys in which the non-native U.S. teachers' native language was identified as English (and for those native U.S. teachers whose first language was identified as other than English). It was presumed that these teachers may have been native to the U.S. (or not truly native to the U.S.) and were stereotyped based on physical characteristics or based on their similarity (dissimilarity) to U.S. nationals. This distinction was deemed necessary as the premise of the study was to ascertain the difference in student perceptions when operating in the intracultural versus the intercultural contexts. Future studies following this line of research should attempt to collect data on the target teacher for simultaneous analyses, thereby controlling for the accuracy in the identification of teacher native culture and language. In the present investigation two questions were asked pertaining to each teacher condition in the attempt to safeguard against such a problem. Students identified, based on their belief, the country/region of origin of the non-native U.S. teacher and whether the teacher's native/first language was English. Likewise, students identified the ethnicity/race of the native U.S. teacher and specified whether they believed that the teacher's native/first language was English. Though there is the possibility that students did not correctly identify culture/region of origin, ethnicity/racial background, and native language correctly, this limitation may not be as important when considering that the purpose of the study was to draw conclusions based on students' perceptions of teacher effectiveness while operating in the intracultural and intercultural classroom contexts. That is, the students identified the context based on their beliefs.

In examining the factors that influence student perceptions of teacher effectiveness certainly it is necessary to gain information from all types of students, those who are native U.S. and those who are non-native U.S. Research needs to not only include an examination of the non-native U.S. students' perceptions, but it would appear to be important to determine if the patterns found in this study are consistent across different non-native U.S. student cultural groups and native U.S. co-cultural (ethnic and racial) groups. That is, future research should attempt to answer the questions: "Do different non-native U.S. student groups perceive native U.S. teachers as more effective than non-native U.S. teachers?" and "Do different native U.S. student co-cultural groups differentially perceive non-native U.S. and native U.S. teacher effectiveness?" No data was collected on the ethnic/racial background of the students in the current study. However, data was collected to identify students by gender, age, and class status. These demographic variables did not yield any significant relationships with regard to evaluations of teacher effectiveness.

Students in the present investigation also indicated the number of past non-native U.S. teachers that they had taken a class from at the university. No significant associations were found between intercultural teacher-student interaction experience and evaluation of teacher effectiveness. This result may have revealed that no true association exists between experience and evaluation, or the finding may point to another limitation inherent to collecting data of this type. For example, the ability of students to recall the number of classes which the instructor was non-native to the U.S. may have been hindered, especially for those students who had reached Junior or Senior status, or had continued their education over an extended period of time. Although intuitively one might reason that increased intercultural experience would serve to provide a decrease in the ambiguity (increase knowledge) surrounding intercultural interactions, the influence of this experience in terms of how it may influence evaluation (positively or negatively) is not known.

The analyses in this research are important because students and teachers might negotiate a style of interaction that is partly a consequence of their initial expectations and partly a consequence of their relational partner's behavior. For example, although native and non-native teachers may behave similarly in the classroom, students may attribute reasons for their behavior quite differently. The variable attributions may be a result of ethnocentrism, anxiety, motivation, and the like. Further, teacher's behaviors may actually be different in the classroom. That is, there is indeed something qualitatively different in the way native U.S. teachers behave and how

non-native U.S. teachers behave. These differences may be due to how the students react to the situational factors surrounding the context of interaction. Past research has indicated that students who experience high levels of anxiety rate teachers lower in terms of effectiveness (Kearney & McCroskey, 1980). Research also indicates that there is an evaluation bias when people evaluate dissimilar others (Brewer & Campbell, 1976). This bias is negative in relation to people from different ethnic or cultural groups. This relationship held true in the analyses in the current research as well.

Some of the features surrounding the contexts of the intercultural and intracultural classrooms that were not illuminated in this study involve possible behaviors that are related to anxiety, ethnocentrism, and motivation which may have served to influence teachers to behave differently than if low levels of anxiety and ethnocentrism, and high levels of motivation existed in the classroom. Future research may need to examine from both the student and teacher perspectives what behaviors are preferred and for what reasons. Daly (1986) cites limitations of the self-report as being potentially biased due to the socially desirable responses that may be expected, and therefore, the use of both self- and other-report measures in research examining communication in the classroom is vital for identifying the level of agreement regarding what behaviors teachers say they engage in and what behaviors students actually perceive them using.

The expectancy literature suggests that when expectations are violated positively that, in the case of negatively stereotyped outgroup members, the evaluator (or student in this case) tend to treat these behaviors as exceptions to the group and in the case of negatively valenced violations of expectations that these behaviors serve to reinforce the negative stereotypes. In that attitudes, such as stereotypes, tend to be generalized it may be more important to determine exactly what behaviors are expected and with what degree of importance these behaviors have in terms of effectiveness ratings in general, as well as determining the importance that these behaviors may have for evaluating teachers who vary in terms of their racial/ethnic background, country/region of origin, and gender.

In the present study students reported what they believed to be the ethnic/racial background of the native U.S. teachers, the country/region of origin of the non-native U.S. teachers, and the gender of the teachers. No significant findings for gender effects were revealed, and only limited conclusions can be drawn regarding teachers' specific ethnic and cultural groups. For convenience, the students primarily identified a broad region for teacher origin or for teacher ethnic category, rather than specifying the precise country of origin or the precise ethnic group. For example, which Asian country the non-native teacher was from or which Asian ethnic group that the native U.S. teacher was considered a member was indeterminable. The choices provided on the survey included four broad categories for students to select from and provided an "other" category for specifying the ethnicity/race or country of origin for the teachers. The problem, once again, is that the students may not have accurately identified this information. The majority of the native U.S. teachers were identified as Caucasian (N = 190), so the results of this investigation may not apply to other co-cultural groups (ethnic/racial native U.S. teacher groups). Approximately one-half of the non-native U.S. teachers (N = 91) were identified as Asian, but it would be presumptuous to infer that the negative evaluations of non-native U.S. teachers refers only to this broadly defined cultural group, when approximately 20 percent (N = 40) of the non-native teachers were identified to be from Europe, and another 20 percent (N = 40) were identified as Latin American. It is possible that some Asian-American native U.S. teachers were categorized and incorrectly placed in the non-native U.S. teacher group, but it is likely that a native U.S. teacher of Asian ethnicity would have been identified as being a native English speaker by the native U.S. students, and therefore the survey would not have been considered (surveys identifying a non-native teacher whose native language was English did not meet the criteria).

It appears that teachers may also be an important group to survey regarding the concern for accurate demographic information and for information of their preferred behaviors

(expectations) for students. Research by McCroskey and Daly (1976) and Smythe and Powers (1978) concludes that teachers have lower expectations of high CA students than they do of low CA students in terms of academic performance at both the elementary and college level. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) point out that it may be difficult to determine whether teacher expectations are due to the behavior of high CA students, or student behavior is a result of teacher expectations. Thus, non-native U.S. teachers, for example, may be influenced by the students' reactions to the intercultural context. This reaction by the teacher may be an indication of their level of anxiety and further serve to complicate the interaction. According to the AUM theory, communication effectiveness requires that a person manage anxiety and uncertainty. Therefore, it is important to discover what behaviors are expected of students, and how these behaviors influence the anxiety and uncertainty from the teachers perspective.

It would be safe to assume that there would be some cultural differences between the two types of teachers and their expectations of student behavior. The example noted above is based on native U.S. teacher expectations. Another unanswered question relevant to this discussion is whether this expectation holds true for teachers from different cultures, and whether this expectation is consistent for different combinations of student-teacher interactions (e.g., non-native U.S. student and non-native U.S. teacher, native U.S. student and non-native U.S. teacher, native U.S. teacher and non-native U.S. student).

Critics of cross-cultural research point out several threats to validity when comparing self-reports of constructs such as those used in the present investigation. Therefore, future investigations should be particularly focused on the following potential problems: (1) lack of contextual equivalence due to differences in communication structures within cultures, (2) lack of connotative equivalence when translating words, such as fear, anxiety and the like, (3) differences in cultures due to homogeneity or heterogeneity of the given cultures, (4) lack of conceptual validity when equating culture with country, (5) problems due to the dynamic nature of culture—what is the shelf-life of cross-cultural research?, and (6) urban bias in cross-cultural research.

The implication of the directions for future research proposed in this discussion should help to supply valuable information which can be utilized to develop teacher training programs specifically designed for teachers facing intercultural classroom situations. At this point, the primary conclusions can be made: (1) Native U.S. teachers are evaluated more favorably than non-native U.S. teachers, (2) Native U.S. teachers produce more favorable learning outcomes than non-native U.S. teachers, (3) Students' evaluations of teachers can, in part, be predicted from their level of ethnocentrism, and (4) Teacher behaviors appear to have a greater influence on effectiveness evaluations than do student traits.

Prior to acting on these conclusions researchers must first determine which native U.S. teacher behaviors are evaluated favorably and whether the same evaluation bias would translate when non-native teachers employ these behaviors. Further, assessment of non-native teachers' behaviors should also be conducted to determine which of the current behaviors are favorably perceived, and therefore should be reinforced. Finally, if the social learning model associated with levels of ethnocentrism is correct, programs may also target the student population in an attempt to increase their cross-cultural knowledge and guide them to "unlearning" the negative attitudes toward non-native teachers reflected in the moderate to high levels of ethnocentrism.

Implications for Non-native Teachers

In terms of possible implications and suggestions for training non-native U.S. teachers, the primary conclusion of this study is that language competence is vital for teaching effectiveness. Native language can be identified as the primary factor in this study which distinguished between an intracultural and an intercultural context. Language and culture are ultimately tied together in a reciprocating fashion—language influences culture, and culture influences language (Gudykunst & Kim, 1988). In order for non-native U.S. teachers to understand student concerns, preferences, and expectations in the U.S. classroom, it is paramount

that non-native teachers have a thorough understanding of the language, the culture, the educational environment, and the underlying value system of the United States.

Harrison and Hopkins (1967) have argued against the effectiveness of the most common model used for preparing people to teach and learn in other cultures. New teachers and students should understand the limitations of this university model. The primary argument to the current model is that simulated situations are very different from actual interactions. For example, in the simulated classroom situation new teachers attempt to solve well-defined problems using well-developed methods. The reality of problem solving in the classroom is that some problems are not well-defined and the emphasis of finding the optimal solution is transferred to finding a workable solution that is acceptable to the hosts, or students. Such solutions may not appear rational, and therefore may necessitate the new teacher to behave in ways that can be disruptive to their personal value system.

Another obvious shortcoming of the training that is provided to non-native teachers prior to interacting in a real classroom is that trainees are evaluated on the basis of their written reports. In an actual encounter, success is measured in terms of how effective are the relationships that are established with the students. The real classroom situation demands mastery of written language, but not to the exclusion of both oral communication skills and a good sense of nonverbal communication.

Bhawuk (1990) points out that with the growth of internationalism, there is an increase in the possibility of encountering people across the globe who dress in Western clothes and are fluent in English. He cautions that one should not come to the conclusion that the value systems of these people are congruent with those of the U.S. The contrary of this should be recognized as important for developers and trainers of cross-cultural teacher orientation programs. Non-native teachers should be made aware that such appearance may be deceptive to students. As noted previously, when expectations are violated in a negative manner, evaluation of the violations tend to be assessed negatively. For non-native teachers to be effective, competence in language and an understanding of the underlying value differences between their native culture and that of the U.S. is suggested. Further, such information should be provided to the students.

In a study by McCroskey and Chung (1997b), students overwhelmingly identified language competence as the primary behavior desired for non-native teachers. The second common theme that emerged from the data was that students preferred non-native teachers to provide information pertaining to the teachers' native culture. Training programs should highlight strategies that teachers can utilize to incorporate cultural examples into their lecture content. In providing students with such information, it is likely that students understanding and attributional confidence with regard to non-native teacher behaviors would increase. According to Bhawuk (1990), for any intercultural interaction to be considered a success, "the hosts must also think and feel positively about the interaction" (p. 327).

In terms of suggested behaviors for non-native teachers the possibility should be emphasized that these teachers can be effective communicators in the U.S. classrooms without losing their own cultural identity. Rather than emulating native U.S. instructor behaviors completely, non-native teachers and other new teachers should incorporate their own unique style with behaviors that are both comfortable and typically perceived as favorable by students. Further, these non-native teachers need to understand that certain behaviors that are successful for one teacher may not be recommended for all teachers.

Table 1
Alpha Reliability of Instruments

Measures			
Individual Differences			
Ethnocentrism	.83		
PRICA	.94		
WTC	.90		
WTC-Classroom	.91		
General Motivation	.87		
Situational Perceptions			
		U.S.	Non-U.S.
WTC with Teacher		.92	.92
Class Motivation		.91	.93
Content Affect		.87	.88
Instructor Affect		.92	.90
Take Course		.96	.97

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics - Individual Differences

Measure	Mean	SD	Range
PRICA	28.7	8.5	14-63
Ethnocentrism	33.5	7.4	17-53
WTC	68.9	16.4	5.9-100
Gen Motivation	26.4	5.0	11-35
WTC - Classroom	57.8	26.5	0-100

Table 3
Descriptive and Inferential Statistics - By Teacher Type

Measure	U.S.		Non-U.S.				Difference		
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D.	r		Mean	S.D.	t
WTC - Instructor	64.1	27.6	54.4	30.0	.57**		9.7	26.9	5.16**
Mot - Instructor	29.6	4.8	26.3	6.2	.08		3.3	7.5	6.29**
Content - Affect		23.1	4.3	21.1	5.0	.16*		1.9	6.0
4.52**									
Instructor - Affect	23.4	4.9	20.5	5.8	.09		2.9	7.2	11.60**
Take - Course	21.0	7.0	17.7	8.3	-.02		3.3	11.0	4.29**
Learning	6.9	1.6	5.5	2.0	-.09		1.4	2.6	7.78**
Ideal Teacher	7.2	1.7	7.1	1.7	.46**		.1	1.7	< 1
Learning Loss	.7	1.1	1.9	2.0	-.09		1.2	2.4	7.08**
Effectiveness	5.8	1.3	4.6	1.8	-.14*		1.2	2.3	7.50**

* $p < .05$
** $p < .0001$

Table 4
Correlations Between Individual Differences and Perceived Differences Between Instructor Types

	Individual Difference Variables				
Difference Measure	WTC	Ethno	PRICA	General Mot	Classroom WTC
Learning	.08	.24**	.12	-.09	.07
Learning Loss	.07	.23**	.14*	-.09	.04
Effectiveness	.01	.24**	.08	-.04	.07
WTC - Class	-.07	.23**	.19*	-.23**	-.06
Motiv - Class	-.11	.26**	.13	-.19*	-.11
Content	-.04	.27***	.20	-.10	-.01
Instructor	-.01	.32***	.15*	-.09	.01
Take Class	.02	.21*	.17*	-.13	.01

* p< .05
** p< .001
*** p< .0001

Table 5
Stepwise Multiple Regression of Learning Difference on Student Traits for Significant Equations

R-Square = .08

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Prob > F
Regression	2	108.7541	54.3770	8.360	0.0003
Error	201	1307.5351	6.5051		
Total	203	1416.2892			

Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Type II Sums of Squares	F	Prob > F
Intercept	-3.4805	1.2686	48.9683	7.53	0.0066
Ethno	0.0975	0.0249	99.6220	15.31	0.0001
WTC	0.0227	0.0112	26.7924	4.12	0.0437

Table 6

Stepwise Multiple Regression of Overall Effectiveness on Student Traits for Significant Equations

R-Square = .06

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Prob > F
Regression	1	65.9642	65.9642	12.86	0.0004
Error	202	1036.3691	5.1305		
Total	203	1102.3333			

Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Type II Sums of Squares	F	Prob > F
Intercept	-1.4222	0.7392	18.9908	3.70	0.0558
Ethno	0.0773	0.0216	65.9642	12.86	0.0004

Table 7
Stepwise Multiple Regression of Learning Loss Difference on Student Traits for Significant Equations

R-Square = .05

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Prob > F
Regression	1	61.4749	61.4749	11.63	0.0008
Error	202	1067.4025	5.2841		
Total	203	1128.8775			

Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Type II Sums of Squares	F	Prob > F
Intercept	-1.3571	0.7502	17.2910	3.27	0.0719
Ethno	0.0746	0.0219	61.4749	11.63	0.0008

Table 8
Stepwise Multiple Regression of Willingness to Communicate Difference on Student Traits for Significant Equations

R-Square = .09

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Prob > F
Regression	2	13929.0108	6964.5054	10.510.0001	
Error	201	133185.3115	662.6135		
Total	203	147114.3223			

Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Type II Sums of Squares	F	Prob > F
Intercept	13.657213.7691	651.8833	0.98	0.3225	
Ethno	0.7439	0.2477	5976.3495	9.02	0.0030
GMot	-1.0957	0.3673	5898.0620	8.90	0.0032

Table 9
Stepwise Multiple Regression of Classroom Motivation Difference on Student Traits for Significant Equations

R-Square = .09

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Prob > F
Regression	2	1045.8982	522.9491	10.02	0.0001
Error	201	10489.3322	52.1857		
Total	203	11535.2304			

Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Type II Sums of Squares	F	Prob > F
Intercept	1.48813.8641		7.7399	0.15	0.7006
Ethno	0.24010.0695		622.7294	11.93	0.0007
Gmot	-0.2378	0.1031	277.7241	5.32	0.0221

Table 10
Stepwise Multiple Regression of Affect Toward Content Difference on Student Traits for Significant Equations

R-Square = .07

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Prob > F
Regression	1	542.9893	542.9893	15.95	0.0001
Error	202	6877.4176	34.0466		
Total	203	7420.4069			

Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Type II Sums of Squares	F	Prob > F
Intercept	-5.5404	1.9042	288.2072	8.47	0.0040
Ethno	0.2218	0.0555	542.9893	15.95	0.0001

Table 11
Stepwise Multiple Regression of Affect Toward Instructor Difference on Student Traits for Significant Equations

R-Square = .10

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Prob > F
Regression	1	1080.6158	1080.6158	22.77	0.0001
Error	202	9585.7959	47.4544		
Total	203	10666.4118			

Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Type II Sums of Squares	F	Prob > F
Intercept	-7.5665	2.2481	537.5501	11.33	0.0009
Ethno	0.3128	0.0656	1080.6158	22.77	0.0001

Table 12
Stepwise Multiple Regression of Behavioral Intent to Take Class Difference on Student Traits for Significant Equations

R-Square = .04

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Prob > F
Regression	1	1034.9745	1034.9745	8.940.0031	
Error	202	23377.7854	115.7316		
Total	203	24412.7598			

Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Type II Sums of Squares	F	Prob > F
Intercept	-6.9556	3.5108	454.2500	3.93	0.0489
Ethno	0.3062	0.1024	1034.9745	8.94	0.0031

References (extended beyond text of paper)

Abe, H., & Wiseman, R. (1983). A cross-cultural confirmation of the dimensions of intercultural effectiveness. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 7, 53-67.

Andersen, J. F. (1978). The relationship between teacher immediacy and teaching effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.

Andersen, J. (1979a). The relationship between teacher immediacy and teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook 3 (pp. 543-559). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Andersen, J. F. (1979b). Perceptions of immediacy and communication style as altered by communication apprehension level. Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Andersen, J., Norton, R. W., & Nussbaum, J. F. (1981). Three investigations exploring relationships between perceived teacher communication behaviors and student learning. Communication Education, 30, 377-392.

Anderson, L., Evertson, C., & Brophy, J. (1979). An experimental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading groups. Elementary School Journal, 79, 193-223.

Barna, L. (1983). The stress factor in intercultural relations. In D. Landis & R. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training, (Vol. 2, pp. 19-49). New York: Pergamon.

Baxter, L. A. (1987). Communication and cognition in the relationship process. In R. Burnett, P. McGhee, & D. Clarke (Eds.), Accounting for relationships: Explanation, representation and knowledge, (pp. 192-212). London: Methuen.

Beatty, M. J., Forst, E. C., & Stewart, R. A. (1986). Communication apprehension and motivation as predictors of public speaking duration. Communication Education, 35, 143-146.

Beebe, S. A., & Masterson, J. T. (1997). Communicating in small groups: Principles & practices, (5th ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley.

Berger, C. R. (1979). Beyond initial interactions. In H. Giles & R. St. Clair (Eds.), Language and social psychology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Berger, C. R. (1987). Planning and scheming: Strategies for initiating relationships. In R. Burnett, P. McGhee, & D. Clarke (Eds.), Accounting for relationships: Explanation, representation, and knowledge, (pp. 158-174). London: Methuen.

Berger, C. R., & Bradac, J. J. (1982). Language and social knowledge: Uncertainty in interpersonal relationships. London: Edward Arnold.

Berger, C. H., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some exploration in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1, 99-112.

Berger, C. R., & Douglas, W. (1981). Studies in interpersonal epistemology III: Anticipated interaction, self-monitoring, and observational context selection. Communication Monographs, 48, 183-196.

Berger, C. R., & Roloff, M. E. (1982). Thinking about friends and lovers: Social cognition and relational trajectories. In M. E. Roloff & C. R. Berger (Eds.), Social cognition and communication (pp. 151-192). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Berscheid, E., Graziano, W., Monson, T., & Dermer, M. (1976). Outcome dependency: Attention, attribution, and attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 978-989.

Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1969). Interpersonal attraction. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bhawuk, D. P. S. (1990). Cross-cultural orientation programs. In R. W. Brislin (Ed.), Applied cross-cultural psychology (pp.325-346). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Brewer, M., & Campbell, D. (1976). Ethnocentrism and intergroup attitudes. New York, NY: Wiley.

Brislin, R. W. (1990). Applied cross-cultural psychology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Brislin, R. W. (1993). Understanding culture's influence on behavior. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Brislin, R. W., Cushner, K., Cherrie, C., & Yong, M. (1986). Intercultural interactions: A practical guide. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Brophy, J. (1986). Socializing student motivation to learn. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, The Institute for Research on Teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 269 384).

Brophy, J. (1987). On motivating students. In D. C. Berliner & B. V. Rosenshine (Eds.), Talks to teachers (pp. 201-245). New York: Random House.

Brown, K. A. (1988). Effects of perceived country of origin, educational status, and native speakerness on American college student attitudes toward non-native instructors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Bruner, J., Goodnow, J., & Austin, G. (1956). A study of thinking. New York: Wiley.

Burgoon, J. K. (1978). A communication model of personal space violations: Explication and an initial test. Human Communication Research, 4, 129-142.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., Hale, J. L., & de Turck, M. A. (1984). Relational messages associated with nonverbal behaviors. Human Communication Research, 10, 351-378.

Burgoon, J. K., Coker, D. A., & Coker, R. A. (1986). Communicative effects of gaze behavior: A test of two contrasting explanations. Human Communication Research, 12, 495-524.

Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1988). Nonverbal expectancy violations theory: Model elaboration and application to immediacy behaviors. Communication Monographs, 55, 58-79.

Byrne, D. (1971). Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1, 659-663.

Buss, A. H. (1980). Self-consciousness and social anxiety. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Carmines, E. G., & Zeller, R. A. (1979). Reliability and validity assessment. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Chan, M. B. (1988). The effects of willingness to communicate on student learning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.

Collier, M. J. (1988). A comparison of intracultural and intercultural communication among acquaintances: How intra- and intercultural competencies vary. Communication Quarterly, 36, 122-144.

Collier, M. J. (1989). Cultural and intercultural communication competence: Current approaches and directions for future research. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 13, 287-302.

Collier, M. J., & Powell, R. G. (1986). The effect of student culture/ethnicity on judgments of instructional communication. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Craig, R. T. (1986). Goals in discourse. In D. G. Ellis & W. A. Donohue (Eds.), Contemporary issues in language and discourse (pp. 257-273).

Crockett, W. H., Mahood, S., & Press, A. N. (1972). Impressions of a speaker as a function of set to understand or to evaluate, of cognitive complexity, and of prior attitudes. (Pp. 168-178. Cognitive factors and impression formation- 1971 SCA).

Cushman, D. P., & Pearce, W. B. (1977). Generality and necessity in three types of theory about communication, with special attention to rules theories. Human Communication Research, 13, 344-352.

Daly, J. A. (1986). Personality and interpersonal communication: Issues and directions. In J. C. McCroskey and J. A. Daly (Eds.), Personality and interpersonal communication. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Davidson, A., & Thompson, E. (1980). Cross-cultural studies of attitudes and beliefs. In H. Triandis & R. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 5. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Delia, J. G., Clark, R. A., & Switzer, D. E. (1979). The context of informal conversations as a function of interactants' interpersonal cognitive complexity. Communication Monographs, 46, 274-281.

Detweiler, R. A. (1980). Intercultural interaction and the categorization process. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 4, 275-293.

Devine, P. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 5-18.

Dijiker, A. (1987). Emotional reactions to ethnic minorities. European Journal of Social Psychology, 17,305-325.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Frymier, A. B. (1993). The relationships among communication apprehension, immediacy, and motivation to study. Communication Reports, 6, 8-17.

Frymier, A. B. (1994). A model of immediacy in the classroom. Communication Education, 42, 133-144.

Gibson, E. J., Owsley, C. J., & Johnston, J. (1978). Perception of invariants by five-month-old infants: Differentiation of two types of motion. Developmental Psychology, 14, 407-415.

Gotch, D., & Brydges, M. (1990, November). Effective teaching in the multi-cultural classroom. Report of a panel presentation for the Community College League of California, Los Angeles, CA.

Guba, E. G., & Getzels, J. W. (1955). Personality and teacher effectiveness: A problem in theoretical research. Journal of Educational Psychology, 46, 355.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1983). Similarities and differences in perceptions of intracultural and intercultural encounters. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 49, 40-65.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1988). Uncertainty and anxiety. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Theories in intercultural communication, (pp.123-156). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1991). Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1995). Anxiety/Uncertainty Management (AUM) Theory: Current Status. In R. L. Wiseman (Ed.), Intercultural communication theory, (pp. 8-58). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Hammer, M. R. (1984). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: Culture specific or culture general. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 8, 1-10.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Hammer, M. R. (1988). Strangers and hosts: An uncertainty reduction based theory of intercultural adaptation. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Intercultural adaptation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (1997). Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication, (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1984). Individual and cultural influences on uncertainty reduction. Communication Monographs, 51, 23-36.

Gudykunst, W. B., Nishida, T., Koike, H., & Shiino, N. (1986). The influence of language on uncertainty reduction: An exploratory study of Japanese-Japanese and Japanese-North American interactions. In M. McLaughlin (Ed.), Communication yearbook, 9. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Gudykunst, W. B., Wiseman, R. L., & Hammer, M. R. (1977). Determinants of a sojourner's attitudinal satisfaction: A path model. In B. Ruben (Ed.), Communication yearbook 1, (pp.415-425). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.

Harrison, R., & Hopkins, R. L. (1967). The design of cross-cultural training: An alternative to the university model. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 3, 431-460.

Hecht, M. L. (1978). The conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication satisfaction. Human Communication Research,3, 253-264.

Hecht, M. L., Larkey, L. K., & Johnson, J. N. (1992). African American and European American perspectives of problematic issues in interethnic communication effectiveness. Human Communication Research, 19, 209-236.

Hecht, M. L., & Ribeau, S. (1987). Afro-American identity and communication effectiveness. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 6, 319-326.

Heider, F. (1946). Attitudes and cognitive organization. Journal of Psychology, 21, 107-112.

Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: John Wiley.

Hewestone, M., & Giles, H. (1986). Stereotypes and intergroup communication. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), Intergroup communication. London: Edward Arnold.

Hurt, H.T., & Priess, R. (1978). Silence isn't necessarily golden: Communication apprehension, desired social choice, and academic success among middle-school students. Human Communication Research, 4, 315-327.

Islam, M. R., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived outgroup variability, and outgroup attitudes. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19,700-710.

Jordan, F. F., & Merkel, A. (1995). Communication/classroom environment, personal, and demographic variables as predictors of perceived cognitive learning. Paper presented at the meeting Speech Communication Association, San Antonio, TX.

Kearney, P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1980). Relationships among teacher communication style: Trait and state communication apprehension and teacher effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook 4 (pp. 533-551). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Keller, J. M. (1983). Motivational design of instruction. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), Instructional design theories: An overview of their current status (pp. 383-434). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kelley, H. H. (1967). Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium of Motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Kelley, H. H. (1972). Causal schemata and the attribution process. In E. Hones et al., (Eds.), Attribution. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Kelley, H. H. (1973). The process of causal attribution. American Psychologists, 28, 107-128.

Kellerman, K., & Reynolds, R. (1990). When ignorance is bliss: The role of motivation to reduce uncertainty in uncertainty reduction theory. Human Communication Research, 17, 5-75.

Kim, H. K. (1991). Influence of language and similarity on initial intercultural interaction. In S. Ting-Toomey & F. Korzenny (Eds.), Cross-cultural interpersonal communication. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Kim, Y. Y. (1991). Intercultural communication competence: A systems-theoretic view. In S. Ting-Toomey & F. Korzenny (Eds.), Cross-cultural interpersonal communication. Interpersonal and intercultural communication annual vol. XV (pp. 259-276). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masin, B. B. (1964). Taxonomy of educational objectives. Handbook II: The affective domain. New York: David McKay, chapters 1-4.

Langer, E. (1989). Mindlessness. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Leary, M. R. (1982). Social anxiety. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), Review of personality and social psychology (Vol. 3). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Leary, M. R. (1990). Anxiety, cognition, and behavior: In search of a broader perspective. In M. Booth-Butterfield (Ed.), Communication, cognition, & anxiety. [Special Issue] Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 5, 39-44.

LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes, and group behavior. New York, NY: John Wiley.

Littlejohn, S. W. (1989). Theories of human communication, (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lukens, J. (1978). Ethnocentric speech. Ethnic Groups, 2, 35-53.

Martin, J. N., & Hammer, M. R. (1989). Measuring categories of intercultural communication competence: Everyday communicators' perceptions. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 13, 303-332.

McCroskey, J. C. (1970). Measures of communication bound anxiety. Speech Monographs, 37, 269-277.

McCroskey, J. C. (1986). An introduction to rhetorical communication (5th Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. Communication Quarterly, 40, 16-25.

McCroskey, J. C., Barraclough, R. A., Fayer, J. M., Richmond, V. P., & Sallinen, A. (1995). The relationship between nonverbal immediacy and cognitive and affective learning: A multi-cultural examination. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

McCroskey, J. C., & Daly, J. A. (1976). Teachers' expectations of the communication apprehension child in the elementary school. Human Communication Research,3, 67-72.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J. C. McCroskey and J. A. Daly (Eds.), Personality and interpersonal communication (pp. 129-156). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1990). Willingness to communicate: Differing cultural perspectives. The Southern Communication Journal, 56, 72-77.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1996). Fundamentals of human communication: An interpersonal perspective. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

McCroskey, L. L., & Chung, L. (1997a). Willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and ethnocentrism: Student perceptions of Asian graduate teaching assistants. Paper presented at the meeting of the Pacific and Asian Communication Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

McCroskey, L. L., & Chung, L. (1997b). Student perceptions and expectations of effectiveness of international teachers: Issues of cultural experience, anxiety, and willingness to communicate. Paper presented at the meeting of the David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies, Hong Kong.

Mestenhauser, J. A. (1983). Learning from sojourners. In D. Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training (Vol. 2, pp. 153-185). New York: Pergamon.

Metts, S., & Cupach, W. R. (1990). The influence of relationship beliefs and problem-solving responses on satisfaction in romantic relationships. Human Communication Research, 17, 170-185.

Miller, G. R., & Steinberg, M. (1975). Between people. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Nettler, G. (1946). The relationship between attitude and information concerning the Japanese in America. American Sociological Review, 11, 177-191.

Neulip, J. W. (1995). A comparison of teacher immediacy in African-American

and Euro-American college classrooms. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Neulip, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The development of intercultural and Interethnic communication apprehension scales. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal, Canada.

Norton, R. (1977). Teacher effectiveness as a function of communicator style. In B. Ruben (Ed.), Communication yearbook 1 (pp. 525-542). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Norton, R. (1983). Communicator style: Theory , application, and measures. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Norton, R., & Nussbaum, J. F. (1980). Dramatic behaviors of the effective teacher. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook 4 (pp. 565-582). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Nussbaum, J. F. (1984). Effective teaching: A communicative nonrecursive causal model. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), Communication yearbook 5 (pp. 737-749). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Nussbaum, J. F. (1984). Classroom behavior and the effective teacher. Communication, 13, 81-94.

Nussbaum, J. F. (1992). Effective teacher behaviors. Communication Education, 38, 334-344.

Nussbaum, J. F., & Scott, M. D. (1980). Student learning as a relational outcome of teacher-student interaction. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook 4 (pp.553-579). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

O'Driscoll, M. & Feather, N. (1983). Perception of value congruence and interethnic behavioral intentions. International journal of Intercultural Relations, 7, 239-252.

O' Hair, D. H., Allman, J., & Moore, S. D. (1996). A cognitive-affective model of relational expectations in the provider-patient context. Journal of Health Psychology, 1, 307-322.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P.H. (1957). The measurement of meaning. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Osgood, C. E., & Tannenbaum (1955). The principle of congruity in the prediction of attitude change. Psychological Review, 62, 42-55.

Pearce, W. B. (1976). The coordinated management of meaning: A rules-based theory of interpersonal communication. In G. R. Miller (Ed.), Explorations in interpersonal communication. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1979). The ultimate attribution error: Extending Allports cognitive analysis of prejudice. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5, 461-476.

Planalp, S. (1985). Relational schemata: A test of alternate forms of relational knowledge as guides to communication. Human Communication Resea-ch, 12, 3-29.

Prisbell, M. (1985). Interpersonal perception variables and communication satisfaction in the classroom. Communication Research Reports, 2, 90-96.

Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation. Communication Education, 39, 369-379.

Richmond, V. P., Gorham, J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1987). The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning. In M. McLaughlin (Ed.), Communication yearbook 10 (pp. 574-590). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1985). Communication: Apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Ringness, T. A. (1968). Mental health in the schools. New York: Random House.

Rokeach, M. (1960). The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Rubovitz, P. C., & Maehr, M. L. (1973). Pygmalion black and white. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25, 210-218.

Sallinen-Kuparinen, A. (1992). Teacher communicator style. Communication Education, 41,

Scott, M. D., & Wheeless, L. R. (1975). Communication apprehension, student attitudes, and levels of satisfaction. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 41, 188-198.

Shimanoff, S. B. (1980). Communication rules: Theory and research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Shimanoff, S. B. (1992). Group interaction via communication rules. In R. S. Cathcart and L. A. Samovar (Eds.), Small group communication: A reader (6th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Smythe, M. J., & Powers, W. G. (1978). When Galatea is apprehensive: The effect of communication apprehension on teacher expectations. In B. Ruben (Ed.), Communication yearbook 2 (pp. 487-491). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Staton-Spicer, A. (1982). Qualitative inquiry in instructional communication: Applications and directions. The Communicator, 12, 35-46.

Staton-Spicer, A., & Wulff, D. (1984). Research in communication and instruction: Categorization and synthesis. Communication Education, 33, 377-391.

Stephan, W. (1985). Intergroup relations. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology (3rd Ed.). New York: Random House.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1984). The role of ignorance in intergroup relations. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), Groups in contact. New York: Academic Press.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. Journal of Social Issues, 41, 157-176.

Street, R. L., & Cappella, J. N. (1985), Sequence and pattern in communication behavior: A model and commentary. In R. L. Street & J. N. Cappella (Eds.), Sequence and pattern in communication behaviour (pp. 243-276). London: Edward Arnold.

Sumner, W. G. (1940). Folkways. Boston: Ginn.

Sunnafrank, M. (1986a). Predicted outcome value during initial interaction: A reformulation of uncertainty reduction theory. Human Communication Research, 13, 3-33.

Sunnafrank, M. (1986b). Predicted outcome values: Just then and now? Human Communication Research, 13, 39-40.

Sunnafrank, M. (1990). Predicted outcome value and uncertainty reduction theories: A test of competing perspectives. Human Communication Research, 17, 76-103.

Tajfel, H. (1981). Social stereotypes and social groups. In J. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), Intergroup behavior. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tamam, E. (1993). The influence of ambiguity tolerance, open-mindedness, and empathy on sojourners' psychological adaptation and perceived intercultural communication effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.

Thomas, C. E. (1995). Perceptions of teacher socio-communicative style: The relationship to affinity-seeking, student liking, motivation, and learning. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1989). Culture and interpersonal relationship development. In J. Anderson (Ed.), Communication yearbook 12 (pp. 371-382). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Triandis, H. C. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of individualism-collectivism. In J. Lerman (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1989 Vol. 37. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Vangeiisti, A. L. (1992). Communication problems in committed relationships: An attributional analysis. In J. H. Harvey, T. L. Orbuch, and A. L. Weber (Eds.), Attributions, accounts, and close relationships (pp. 144-164). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Wiseman, R. L., Hammer, M. R., & Nishida, H. (1989). Predictors of intercultural communication competence. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 13, 348-359.

Witte, K. (1993). Theory of cognitive and negative affect: Extending Gudykunst and Hammer's theory of uncertainty and anxiety reduction. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 17, 197-215.